DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 074 24 SP 005 246

AUTHOR	Rogers, Theresa F.; And Others
TITLE	Small-Project Grants of the Regional Research Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Bureau of Applied Social Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-B-901
PUB DATE	Nov 70
GRANT	OEG-2-9-420-901-0716
NOTE	365p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Research, *Educational Researchers, Federal Programs, *Grants, *Regional Programs, Research Projects, *Research Proposals, Success Factors

ABSTRACT

This study examines the distribution of applicants for small grants, the consequences of being funded, and the processing of proposals. The sample included every applicant submitting a proposal in fiscal 1968. The following data were collected: 1) questionnaires from applicants, both funded and not funded; 2) factual material from proposals submitted; 3) questionnaires from field readers; 4) field reader ratings of proposals and funding recommendations; 5) interviews with the Directors of Educational Research at the nine regional offices. The report is organized according to the life-history of a research project--from submission of the research plan through dissemination of the findings. Chapter headings are 1) the applicant and his institution, 2) the successful applicant, 3) the proposal, 4) developing the proposal, 5) processing the proposal, 6) effects of the research, 7) appraisal of the program, and 8) conclusions and recommendations. A major conclusion is that the Regional Research Program is successful in its goal of identifying and supporting less established researchers. (Appendixes contain a comparison of respondents and non-respondents to the applicant questionnaire and the field reader questionnaire, tables not included in the body of the report, the questionnaires, and the codebook containing the frequency distribution of responses to each item.) (Author/RT)

ED054074

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-B-901
Grant No. OEG 2-9-420-901-0716

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SMALL-PROJECT GRANTS OF THE REGIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

Theresa F. Rogers • Lois W. Sanders • Bernard Levenson

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
New York, New York 10025

November, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP005246

Only copies of this report submitted to the Office of Education include the questionnaires used in the study. If you are interested in obtaining a copy of either questionnaire, please write to the Librarian at the Bureau of Applied Social Research, 605 West 115th Street, New York, New York 10025.

CONTENTS

Page

Table of Contents i

List of Tables 1

Prefatory Note 8

Summary 9

Introduction 15

CHAPTER

ONE The Applicant and His Institution 19

TWO The Successful Applicant 29

THREE The Proposal 45

FOUR Developing the Proposal 60

FIVE Processing the Proposal 75

SIX Effects of the Research 88

SEVEN Appraisal of the Program 107

EIGHT Conclusions and Recommendations 128

APPENDICES

A. Sample

B. Supplementary Tables

C. Applicant Questionnaire

Field Reader Questionnaire

Codebook

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1.1 A College or University Is the Cooperating Institution for Five Out of Six Proposals 20

1.2 More Than One Half of College or University Sponsored Proposals Originate Outside of Education Departments 21

1.3 Three Out of Ten Applicants Are Students 21

1.4 Six Out of Ten Students Are Studying for a Ph.D. 22

1.5 Two-Thirds of the Employed Applicants Are Faculty Members at a College or University 23

1.6 All Faculty Ranks Are Represented Among Applicants 24

1.7 A Majority of the Applicants Specialize in the Field of Education 25

1.8 More Applicants Have Earned a Ph.D. in a Discipline Than Either an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. in Education 26

1.9 Two Out of Three Doctorates Have Been Earned Since 1960 . . . 27

2.1 Colleges or Universities Sponsor the Highest Proportion of Funded Applicants 30

2.2 Applicants Sponsored by University Research Bureaus Are Most Likely to Be Funded 32

2.3 Applicants with the Doctorate or a Master's Degree in a Discipline Are Most Likely to Be Funded 34

2.4 Applicants Who Have Never Received a Research Grant Are More Likely to Be Funded 36

2.5 Applicants Trained in a Discipline But Affiliated with a School of Education Are More Likely to Be Funded 38

2.6 Psychologists Are More Likely to Be Funded Than Specialists in Any Other Field 39

2.7 Funding Within Psychology and Within Education Varies by Sub-Area 41

List of Tables

Table | Page

2.8 Ph.D.'s Trained in Education Are Most Likely to Be Funded When Their Field is Psychology 42

3.1 The Subject Matter of Proposals 46

3.2 A Variety of Subject Matters Are Funded 47

3.3 Level of Education to Be Studied 48

3.4 Seven Out of Ten Proposals Specify That Students Will Be Studied 49

3.5 The Study Designs of Proposals Vary Considerably 51

3.6 A Variety of Study Designs Is Used Within Each Subject Area 52

3.7 Tests of Significance or Analysis of Variance Are the Most Frequently Named Modes of Analysis 53

3.8 Proposals That Specify the Modes of Data Processing Budget for Use of a Computer 54

3.9 Three Out of Five Applicants Request the Maximum in Federal Funds 54

3.10 Less Than One-Half of the Proposals Intended for Dissertations Request Maximum Federal Funds 55

3.11 The Median Total Costs of Budget Items 57

3.12 Per Cent of Budget for Indirect Costs Varies 58

4.1 Applicants Learn About the RRP from a Colleague or Superior 61

4.2 Applicants with Well-Defined Research Plans Before They Think of Applying to RRP Are More Likely to Be Funded . . . 62

4.3 Fewer Than One in Five Applicants Submitted a Similar Proposal to Another Funding Agency 63

4.4 USOE "Guidelines" and a "Resource Person" Are Available to Most Applicants 64

4.5 Applicants Selectively Utilize Resources 65

List of Tables

Table Page

4.6 Having a Resource Available, More Than Utilizing It, Increases the Chance of Funding 67

4.7 Applicants Who Use Many Resources Have No More Chance of Being Funded Than Those Who Use Few 68

4.8 Applicants Who Discuss Their Proposal with a USOE Official Before Submission Are More Likely to Be Funded 69

4.9 The Clerical Costs of Preparing the Proposal Are Not Related to Funding 72

4.10 The Applicant's Department or Institution Usually Pays the Clerical Costs 73

4.11 The Applicant Who Personally Pays the Clerical Costs Is Least Likely to Be Funded 73

5.1 The Majority of Applicants Wait Longer Than Expected for the Funding Decision 76

5.2 One Out of Five Not Funded Applicants Who Asked for an Explanation of the Funding Decision Failed to Receive One 79

5.3 Five Out of Six Applicants Think Field Reader Comments Should Be Sent to Them 82

5.4 Four Out of Five Field Readers Think Their Comments Should Be Sent to Applicants 82

6.1 Six Out of Seven Researchers Discuss Their Project in Class 89

6.2 Researchers with or Without Teaching Responsibilities Discuss Their Projects in Class 90

6.3 Funded Applicants Within University Research Bureaus Invariably Discuss Their Projects in Class 91

6.4 RRP-Supported Research Leads to Changes in Curriculum 93

6.5 RRP Research Completed by Students Is Most Likely to Result in Curriculum Changes 94

6.6 The RRP-Supported Researcher Is Most Frequently Invited to Discuss His Project with a Seminar in His Own Department . . 95

List of Tables

Table | Page

6.7 Teachers Who Advise on Dissertations Are Most Likely to Have Student Assistants on RRP Projects 96

6.8 Four Out of Five Dissertation Advisors Who Also Teach Expect Student Assistants to Do More Research 97

6.9 Researchers Not Writing Dissertations Are More Likely to Present Papers at Professional Meetings 98

6.10 The Ph.D. in a Discipline Is Most Likely to Publish the Results of His RRP-Supported Research 99

6.11 Almost Every Ph.D. in a Discipline Has Published a Research Study Before Applying for RRP Funds 100

6.12 Three Out of Four Doctoral Students Who Intend Their RRP Project for a Dissertation Also Plan to Publish the Results of Their Research 101

6.13 RRP-Supported Doctoral Students Who Earn an Ed.D. Are Most Likely to Plan to Publish the Results of Their Research 102

6.14 Few RRP Researchers Are Asked to Take on Assignments Related to Their Research 103

6.15 Four Out of Five Doctoral Students Report That Their Interest in Research on Education Has Been Strengthened as a Result of Their Projects 105

6.16 Only RRP-Supported Doctoral Students Change Institutional Affiliation After Starting Their Research 105

7.1 Three Out of Four Field Readers Who Have Reviewed RRP Proposals at a Panel Session Prefer the Panel System . . . 108

7.2 Changes in the USOE Evaluation Form Recommended by Field Readers 111

7.3 Field Readers Value Most the Exposure to New Research Ideas That Results from Reviewing RRP Proposals 115

7.4 Four Out of Ten Field Readers Commenting on the RRP See It as a Sound Program 116

7.5 A Considerable Proportion of Applicants and Field Readers Think the $10,000 Ceiling for Small-Project Research Should Be Raised 119

7

List of Tables

Table Page

7.6 Two Out of Five Applicants and Field Readers Lack a Clear Image of the Research Interests of the RRP 122

7.7 More Funded Applicants View the RRP as Venturesome Than Either Field Readers or Not Funded Applicants 124

7.8 A Majority of the Directors of the RRP Are Fairly Strict About Allowing Departures from Proposals 125

7.9 One Out of Three Applicants and Field Readers Say the RRP Requires the Same Amount of "Red Tape" as Other Granting Agencies 126

A.1 Applicant Sample A-2

A.2 Comparison Between Respondents and Non-Respondents in Applicant Survey A-3

A.3 Comparison Between Respondents and Non-Respondents in Field Reader Survey A-5

B1.1 Five Out of Six Doctoral Students Are Working Toward Degrees in Education B-1

B1.2 Four Out of Five Doctoral Students Intend the RRP Research for Their Dissertations B-2

B1.3 Ninety-Seven Per Cent of the Applicants Are White B-2

B1.4 Five Out of Six Applicants Are Male B-3

B1.5 Nine Out of Ten Applicants Are Married B-3

B1.6 Applicants Typically Have Between Two and Three Dependents B-4

B1.7 The Median Age of Applicants Is Approximately Thirty-Eight B-4

B1.8 In 1968, the Median Income of Applicants Was $14,000 . . . . B-5

B1.9 In 1969, the Median Income of Applicants Was $16,000 . . . . B-5

B1.10 The Parents of Two-Thirds of the Applicants Had No More Than a High School Education B-6

List of Tables

Table Page

B2.1 **Proportion of Applicants Funded by Previous Research Grants** B-7

B3.1 The Subject Matter of Proposals Varies B-8

B3.2 The Sample Size for Student Groups Varies B-9

B3.3 When Students Are Studied, Race or Ethnicity Is Seldom Specified B-9

B3.4 Few Proposals Focusing on Students Specify the Student's Economic Level B-10

B3.5 Less Than One-Half of the Proposals Focusing on Teachers Specify the Sample Size B-10

B3.6 Total Cost for Budget Items B-11

B4.1 Applicants with More Than Three Resources Available Have a Better Chance of Being Funded B-17

B4.2 The Director of Educational Research Is Usually the USOE Official with Whom Applicants Discuss Their Proposals . . . B-17

B4.3 Almost All Funded Applicants Find Discussing Their Proposals with a USOE Official Helpful B-18

B4.4 Applicants Typically Spend About Forty-Eight Hours Preparing Their Proposals B-18

B4.5 Applicants Who Spend Less Than Twenty Hours Preparing Their Proposals Are Least Likely to Be Funded B-19

B4.6 A Majority of the Applicants Prepare Proposals on Their Own Time B-19

B4.7 The Median Clerical Cost for Preparing a Proposal Is $48 . . B-20

B5.1 Seven Out of Ten Not Funded Applicants Ask for an Explanation of the Granting Decision B-21

B5.2 Four Out of Five Not Funded Applicants Are Dissatisfied with the Explanation of the Granting Decision B-21

List of Tables

Table Page

B6.1 Most RRP Projects Were Nearly Completed or Completed at the Time of the Survey B-22

B6.2 Two Out of Three RRP Projects Have Student Assistants B-22

B6.3 Two-Thirds of the Funded Applicants Present Papers Based on Their Projects at Professional Meetings B-23

B6.4 Six Out of Ten Funded Applicants Present Papers Based on Their Projects at National Meetings of Professional Societies B-24

B6.5 Seven Out of Ten Funded Applicants Prepare Manuscripts for Publication Based on Their Projects B-25

B6.6 Funded Applicants Most Frequently Write Journal Articles Based on Their Projects B-26

B6.7 Seven Out of Ten Funded Applicants Report That RRP Experience Has Strengthened Their Interest in Research on Education B-27

B6.8 Three Out of Four Funded Applicants Remain at the Same Institution After Starting Their Research B-27

B7.1 Four Out of Five Field Readers Who Reviewed Proposals During Fiscal Year 1968 Are Still Field Readers B-28

B7.2 Virtually Every Field Reader Has Served as an Individual Reviewer B-28

B7.3 Only One Out of Four Field Readers Has Participated in a Panel Meeting B-29

B7.4 One Out of Three Field Readers Prefer the Panel System for Reviewing Proposals B-29

B7.5 Some Field Readers Approve Adding Criteria to the Four Now Used to Evaluate Proposals B-30

PREFATORY NOTE

This report on the small-project grants administered under the Regional Research Program of the U. S. Office of Education is based on data obtained from applicants submitting proposals for grants, the field readers reviewing these proposals, and the Directors of Educational Research responsible for implementing the Program within the nine regions (now ten) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. All of these individuals have contributed generously to this effort. The data cover Fiscal Year 1968 (July, 1967 through June, 1968); however, experiences extending to the end of the survey (May, 1970) are also reported. Whenever appropriate, the analysis specifies these time distinctions. The findings are applicable to the circumstances existing in fiscal 1968 and to this sample of respondents.

The reader should bear in mind that the report treats the regions as a whole, even though conditions for implementing the Program may vary from region to region. Each Director faces a particular set of local considerations and as a consequence the statements in the report do not apply uniformly to each region. Similarly, it would be surprising if the Directors agreed with every one of our interpretations. Where we are aware of differences in points of view, we note them in the text. The conclusions and recommendations are completely those of the authors.

SUMMARY

Background

To facilitate contact between applicants for small research grants and the U.S. Office of Education, the Regional Research Program (RRP) was established in September, 1966. Within a year, offices were operating within each of the nine regions[1] across the country to award grants for small-project research. The researcher interested in studying an educational problem submits a proposal to the regional office in his geographic area. His request for USOE support must not exceed $10,000, and the project must be completed within eighteen months.

The specific objectives of the Program are:

1. To support significant, small-scale educational research projects.
2. To facilitate participation in educational research by a broad range of college and university personnel.
3. To encourage small colleges to undertake research programs so that students may benefit from having professors who are engaged in educational research activities.
4. To provide for direct and expeditious handling of proposals.[2]

Objectives and Procedures of This Study

In the summer of 1968 the Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University was awarded a contract by the U.S. Office of Education to study the effects of the RRP. In particular, this research was designed to examine the Program with respect to: (1) the distribution of applicants for small grants; (2) the consequences of being funded; and (3) the processing of proposals.

---

[1] A tenth office was opened September 15, 1970.

[2] Regional Project Research Guidelines for Preparing a Proposal, Bureau of Research, Regional Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (March, 1969), p. 1.

The following data have been collected:

1. Questionnaires from 665 applicants who submitted proposals in Fiscal 1968. (Return rate was 78 per cent.)

2. Factual material from all proposals submitted in Fiscal 1968.

3. Questionnaires from 423 field readers who reviewed the proposals submitted in Fiscal 1968. (Return rate was 85 per cent.)

4. Field reader ratings of proposals and funding recommendations.

5. Interviews with the Directors of Educational Research at the nine regional offices.

Findings[3]

A. Applicants and Their Proposals

1. In the main, researchers applying to the RRP are young. Three out of ten are students, most of whom are studying for a Ph.D. Of the applicants who have earned a doctorate, nearly half (43 per cent) received it since 1964. Two-thirds of the employed applicants are faculty members of a college or university; the highest proportion of these are assistant professors.

2. Although a high number of applicants specialize in education (54 per cent), almost as many (45 per cent) are in disciplines--fairly strong evidence that the Program attracts applicants with a broad range of interests in research on the educational implications of their disciplines.

3. Thirty-eight per cent of the applicants were funded.

4. Applicants with either a master's degree or a doctorate in a discipline are equally likely to be funded. In addition, they are more likely to be funded than applicants with comparable degrees whose specialty is education, suggesting that the talented researcher is recruited to education rather than trained in education.

5. The Program funds the less experienced researcher. Both pre- and post-doctoral applicants who have never received a research grant

---

[3] The findings are based on the respondents. A comparison of respondents and non-respondents to the applicant questionnaire and to the field reader questionnaire is presented in Appendix A.

are more likely to be funded than the ones who have previously been awarded a grant or two. Moreover, among applicants from a discipline who have never received a grant, the pre-doctoral applicant has as much chance of being funded as the post-doctoral one. (Fifty-four per cent of these pre-doctoral applicants and 52 per cent of these post-doctoral ones are funded.)

6. Applicants whose major field is psychology are more frequently funded than those in any other field. Within psychology, it is the applicant specializing in learning or development who is most likely to obtain funds (55 per cent).

7. A review of the proposals shows that 30 per cent have psychology as their subject matter; 27 per cent, education; and the remaining 43 per cent include a number of subjects extending from art through zoology.

8. Taken together, the elementary and secondary levels are of greatest interest; less than 10 per cent focus on pre-school. Students are the most popular object of research, and outside of the few (14 per cent) who study teachers, almost no one plans to study participants in the educational process other than students.

9. Many applicants fail to specify adequately the research procedures of their proposed projects. For example, one-third who plan to study students do not indicate even an approximate sample size; one-fourth of the applicants neglect to state how they expect to analyze the data; and one-third do not specify how they will process the data.

10. Applicants who intend their projects for doctoral dissertations are less likely than other applicants to request the maximum amount of federal support.

11. Professional salaries are the major budget expense.

12. When preparing proposals, most applicants have access to the USOE Guidelines and to a resource person knowledgeable about seeking research funds. However, less than one-half have other types of resources available at their institutions such as: copies of previously submitted proposals, sample application forms from funding agencies, or ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) materials. The likelihood of being funded appears to be related more to the type and number of such resources available to the applicant than to which resources or how many he uses. Whether an applicant uses a particular resource depends on a number of factors, possibly his research training, his experience in writing proposals, or the stage of his research plan. The important factor is the availability of resources. The wider the range of choice, the greater the opportunity for the researcher to select those appropriate to his needs.

13. Applicants who have well-defined research plans compatible with the Program guidelines before they think of applying to the Program

are more likely to be funded than those who develop plans after they decide to apply. This suggests that the Program provides support for promising research ideas waiting to be tested. Without the Program's support these ideas might remain in the mind of the researcher--and, in a sense, become lost knowledge.

14. Typically, the applicant's source of information about the Program is a colleague or superior.

15. Applicants are critical of the length of time it took to process their proposals. The delay was due largely to understaffing and budget freezes which plagued Fiscal 1968, the year of this study, and which continue to hamper the operation of the Program. In fact, the Program has yet to have a normal year.

16. The negative consequences of budget freezes go beyond protracted processing of applicant proposals. The freezes prevent the Directors of Educational Research from traveling to institutions in their regions and may alter proposal processing. Minimal staffing in the regional offices impedes the general office work and communication between the regional offices and applicants.

17. Not funded applicants in some regions criticize the perfunctory way that they were informed of the granting decision. After spending time preparing a proposal, they were sent only a short form letter. Not funded applicants in other regions received an explanation of the decision and commented on how helpful it had been.

18. An alternative way to explain the granting decision to applicants is to transmit field reader comments directly to them. Five out of six applicants, whether funded or not, favor this method of feedback, as do four out of five field readers. Although the viewpoints of the Directors diverge on this topic, those who have not adopted the practice are willing to give it consideration.

19. The utilization and dissemination of research findings from funded projects is considerable. Six out of seven researchers discuss their projects in class; about half present their projects at departmental seminars; 67 per cent prepare (or will prepare) papers for professional meetings; and 72 per cent, manuscripts for publication.

20. Student researchers who intend their projects for dissertations are a particularly interesting group. They are more likely than non-students to recommend course or curriculum changes, to plan to publish the results of their projects, and to report that their interest in research on education has been strengthened as a result of their projects --evidence that the Program's investment in the less experienced researcher pays off.

21. Funded applicants who are also advisors for doctoral dissertations have student assistants on their projects. Four out of five of

these (funded) applicants anticipate that these students will do further research.

B. Field Readers

22. Field readers and the Directors of the Program overwhelmingly agree that the panel system for reviewing proposals is superior to obtaining reviews by correspondence.

23. Field readers have suggestions for changing the Field Reader Evaluation Form. A majority would separate the criterion "adequacy of personnel and facilities into two criteria, "adequacy of personnel" and "adequacy of facilities." An equally large number think a rating scale should be provided for evaluating each of the four criteria: educational significance, soundness of research design, adequacy of personnel and facilities, and economic efficiency.

24. In their assessment of the Program, field readers indicate that they value the exposure to new research ideas and the intellectual stimulation that result from reviewing proposals. They are disappointed, however, with the limited contact they have with the Program; the lack of feedback on proposals they evaluate; the amount of remuneration; and the time lapse between review of a proposal and payment.

C. Opinions of Applicants, Field Readers and
Directors of Educational Research

25. Most applicants and field readers agree that the present $10,000 ceiling on individual projects should be raised. They favor a ceiling closer to $15,000. The Directors have different points of view. One advocates retaining the present ceiling; another thinks there should be none; while several others favor a sliding scale with provision for varying levels of support. In general, these Directors think it is appropriate to support established researchers at a higher level than doctoral candidates.

26. Only the Directors of the Program have a clear impression of the Program's policies and practices. Many applicants and field readers do not know whether the Program supports a broad or a narrow range of interests in education, whether it tends to be orthodox or venturesome in its support of research, or whether it is fairly strict or lenient in allowing departures from the research plans stated in proposals.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The major conclusion of this study is that the USOE Regional Research Program, committed as it is to developing research on education, is achieving one of its prime objectives. This does not mean, however, that the Program is without fault. Indeed, having studied the Program from several perspectives, we offer ten recommendations for improving it. Moreover, it is important for these recommendations to be implemented in the near future or a good program will be undermined.

These recommendations are:

1. The administrative budget for the Directors of Educational Research should be stabilized.
2. The research budget for small-project grants should be increased.
3. The $10,000 ceiling for individual projects should be raised to $15,000 plus overhead.
4. The panel method of review should be continued.
5. Applicants should be notified of the status of their proposals within sixty days of submission.
6. Field reader comments should be sent to every applicant.
7. The Directors of Educational Research should offer direction to institutions in the selection of materials to expand their resources for developing proposals.
8. The Directors of Educational Research should increase their communication with both applicants and field readers.
9. The Guidelines for preparing the proposal document should be revised.
10. Periodic summaries of applicant and proposal data should be compiled.

INTRODUCTION

> The Regional Research Program is close to the action ... geography is not irrelevant. Investigators must have some place to turn with their unsolicited, ... proposals.
>
> Field Reader

> The whole idea of regionalization is exciting. Washington is frightening to so many people. They [applicants] don't know which door to knock on.
>
> USOE Staff Member

> The [Regional Research] Program gave me a chance to get off the ground.
>
> Funded Applicant

These three persons view the Regional Research Program of the U.S. Office of Education as filling a research need. They all know that seeking funds for research is no simple task. The prospective researcher must find out which agencies support research in his field, comprehend the eligibility requirements, obtain application forms and instructions, and then prepare a proposal, budget, and time schedule that can compete with an unknown number of others. The individual who at one time believed that he had a researchable problem can easily lose sight of that goal as the process of applying consumes his energy.

To facilitate contact between an applicant and a granting agency, the U.S. Office of Education established the Regional Research Program (RRP) in September, 1966. By September, 1967, an office had been opened in each of the nine existing DHEW (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) regions[1] across the country to award contracts for small-project research. To participate, the researcher submits a proposal for educational research to the regional office in his geographic area. There are two fundamental requirements: (1) USOE support must not exceed $10,000; and (2) the project must be completed within eighteen months.

---

[1] A tenth office was opened September 15, 1970.

The specific goals of the Program are:

1. To support significant, small-scale educational research projects.
2. To facilitate participation in educational research by a broad range of college and university personnel.
3. To encourage small colleges to undertake research programs so that students may benefit from having professors who are engaged in educational research activities.
4. To provide for direct and expeditious handling of proposals.[2]

As one Director of Educational Research phrased it, the RRP is committed to "building research resources." Regionalization itself is intended to simplify application procedures, and to make it easier for the promising researcher to compete for funds. As the regional office facilities become known in each locale, it is hoped that increasing numbers of researchers will seek the Program's support.

Generally, the Program's goals are not directed to resource building exclusively, but include dissemination and utilization of the results of research. In fact, dissemination is so important that USOE compiles abstracts, published monthly in RIE (Research in Education), to provide an overview of research on education throughout the nation. The individual researcher can augment this type of dissemination by utilizing his research to (1) improve classroom teaching; (2) to stimulate thinking about educational problems among his colleagues, either through personal contact on campus or through professional meetings or publications; and (3) to develop interest in research on education among students. These are secondary outcomes the Directors of Educational Research anticipate from funded projects.

Objectives and Procedures of This Study

This study of the RRP has three objectives, all related to the effects of the RRP. In particular, we have sought to examine the Program with respect to: (1) the distribution of applicants for small grants; (2) the consequences of being funded; and (3) the processing of proposals.

---

[2] Regional Project Research Guidelines for Preparing a Proposal, Bureau of Research, Regional Research Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (March, 1969), p. 1.

To accomplish the objectives, the following data have been collected:

1. Questionnaires from applicants, one version from funded applicants and another from those not funded
2. Factual material from the proposals submitted by applicants
3. Questionnaires from field readers who reviewed the proposals in the sample
4. Field reader ratings of proposals and funding recommendations
5. Interviews with the Directors of Educational Research at the nine regional offices.

In consultation with the Directors of the Program, it was decided to collect data from the July 1, 1967 through June 30, 1968 (Fiscal 1968) period in which all nine regional offices were operational. This is also the latest period that could be considered if applicants were to have an opportunity to complete projects prior to responding to the questionnaire. Although concentrating on Fiscal 1968 sacrifices the opportunity to describe recent applicants, it seems preferable to examine the effects of the research than to survey applicants whose research is still in the planning or data-collection stage. The sample includes every applicant submitting a proposal in Fiscal 1968.

The information obtained from these applicants about their educational backgrounds, positions, and institutional affiliations provides valuable baseline data. These data make it possible to compare applicants in later years with applicants in this study. Such cumulative data will enable policy makers to evaluate the Program and plan its development, taking into account statistical evidence about the researchers attracted by the Program.

Plan of the Report

The report is organized according to the life-history of a research project--from submission of the research plan through dissemination of the findings. Chapter One, by describing the characteristics of applicants, answers the question: Who applies to the Program? Chapter Two focuses on the funded applicant and shows to what extent the Program succeeds in supporting the less experienced researcher who has developed a small-scale project having educational significance.

Chapter Three introduces the proposal section. It reviews the proposal itself, taking into account the subject matter, research design, modes of analysis, and budget. Chapter Four reports how the applicant learns of the Program, the resources he has available and those he uses while writing his proposal. The cost of preparing the document is also examined. Chapter Five deals with processing the proposal and considers the procedures for submission from three points of view: that of applicants, field readers, and the Directors of Educational Research.

The outcomes of RRP-supported research are the topic of Chapter Six. Here the impact of the researcher's work on classroom teaching, colleague exchanges, and students is presented. Chapter Seven completes the analysis by providing an appraisal of the Program based on the opinions of applicants, field readers, and the Directors of Educational Research. It considers the process of review, the ceiling on grants, and the image of the Program.

Chapter Eight presents conclusions and recommendations of this study of small-project educational research under the RRP.

The report contains four supplementary sections: (1) a summary of the report; (2) a comparison of respondents and non-respondents to the applicant questionnaire and to the field reader questionnaire; (3) tables not included in the body of the report; and (4) the questionnaires and the codebook containing the frequency distribution of responses to each item of information.

CHAPTER ONE

THE APPLICANT AND HIS INSTITUTION

Every proposal submitted to the USOE Regional Research Program (RRP) is unsolicited. For this reason alone, it is of interest to know who chooses to apply. Moreover, the eligibility requirements are few. First, a prospective applicant must have the sponsorship of an institution or organization within the United States or its outlying territories. Second, he cannot be conducting another project funded by the Program; and third, he must have fulfilled the terms of any prior grant or contract he may have received from the U.S. Office of Education. More positively, the Program seeks to attract the individual interested in undertaking a small-scale project of some educational significance for which he has developed a suitable research design and procedures.

This chapter describes the background of those who apply and, in effect, answers the question: Who does the Program reach? We have considerable data from the 665 applicants with which to build a statistical profile of those who apply. In particular, we will consider the institutional sponsorship of the applicant's proposal, his employment status, field of interest, professional activities, academic training, and family background.

Cooperating Institution

Every applicant[1] to the RRP as noted above, must have the sponsorship of an institution or organization such as a college, university, school system, or private firm.[2] This sponsor is listed on the title page of the proposal as the cooperating institution. Table 1.1 shows that the great majority of proposals submitted to the RRP--84 per cent--name a college or university as the cooperating institution.

The fact that most applicants list a college or university as the cooperating institution suggests that institutions of higher education have the resources and facilities necessary for small-project research. They train professionals for teaching and research and have at hand classroom, laboratory, and library facilities essential for pursuing research.

One might expect that proposals submitted to the RRP would originate in Schools of Education. In actuality over one-half come from

---

[1] The applicant is defined as the person who intends to conduct the research and devote a considerable proportion of his time to it. Typically, the applicant is the project director named on the proposal.

[2] Since this study was conducted, the regulations have been changed so that projects of individuals not associated with an institution can be funded.

TABLE 1.1

A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY IS THE COOPERATING INSTITUTION FOR FIVE OUT OF SIX PROPOSALS

Cooperating Institution	Proportion of proposals submitted
College or university	.84
School system	.10
Private agency (e.g., a rehabilitation agency)	.04
State department of education	.01
Other (e.g., individual firm, educational association)	.01
TOTAL	1.00 (665)

other departments (Table 1.2). More often than not, this is a liberal arts department such as psychology, but proposals can and do come from such diverse subdivisions as a Department of Physical Education, a College of Medicine, or a School of Engineering.

Both students and non-students are eligible for support from the RRP. In fact, three out of every ten applicants are students working either part-time or full-time toward an advanced degree (Table 1.3).

Employment Status

Of student applicants, the highest proportion are studying for a Ph.D. rather than an Ed.D. degree. To be specific, Table 1.4 shows that 60 per cent of the student applicants seek a Ph.D. degree; 35 per cent, an Ed.D.; and 4 per cent, a master's degree in education or a discipline.

Later in this chapter when we discuss applicants who have already earned doctorates, we will contrast those holding a doctorate in one of the disciplines with those holding a doctorate in education. Here we only direct attention to the fact that more student applicants are enrolled in Ph.D. programs.[3]

---

[3] We know for some student applicants (113 of the 201) the kind of doctorate they earned in 1968 or expected to earn by 1969. Fifty

TABLE 1.2

MORE THAN ONE HALF OF COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY SPONSORED PROPOSALS ORIGINATE OUTSIDE OF EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS

Sponsoring Department	Proportion of proposals submitted
School or department of education	.47
Liberal arts department	.31
Professional school or administrative office	.15
Research bureau	.07
TOTAL	1.00 (560)
NA =	1
Cases excluded*	104
	665

*Not from an institution of higher education.

TABLE 1.3

THREE OUT OF TEN APPLICANTS ARE STUDENTS

Employment Status	Proportion of applicants
Employed only	.69
Both employed and a student	.20
Student only	.10
Other status (e.g., post-doctoral fellow, emeritus professor)	.01
TOTAL	1.00 (665)

TABLE 1.4

SIX OUT OF TEN STUDENTS ARE
STUDYING FOR A PH.D.

Degree Sought	Proportion of applicants	
Ph.D.	.60	
Ed.D.	.35	
Master's	.04	
TOTAL	.99	(201)
Cases excluded*		464
		665

*Applicants not working toward a degree.

Moreover, not every doctoral or master's candidate who applies to the RRP intends his research for meeting academic requirements. Of the 201 student applicants, 159 said they intended their proposed research for a doctoral dissertation. At the time they submitted their proposals to the RRP, 156 were working toward a doctorate and only three were completing requirements for a master's degree, but these students were looking ahead to the time they would be using their RRP-supported research for a doctoral dissertation. It should be added that another 27 applicants are dissertation advisors who anticipate that data from their proposed research will be used by one of their students for a dissertation.[4]

A major problem confronting the nine Directors of Educational Research is determining an equitable support level for doctoral candidates, if they should be supported at all. Each has his own point of view and, at present, they diverge considerably. One, for example, wants doctoral students to use the Program, but he advocates consultation with USOE during the planning stage of the dissertation so that the student incorporates USOE standards in the prospectus, as well as those of the department. From his experience too many students want to "tap the Program for funds" after the department has approved the project.

---

per cent of these indicated their degree would be a Ph.D. in education; 37 per cent specified an Ed.D.; and 13 per cent, a Ph.D. in a discipline. See Appendix B, Table 1.1.

[4] Appendix B, Table 1.2

Two Directors of Educational Research take the opposite view and recommend discontinuing support of dissertations. They feel that fellowships are available elsewhere; doctoral students come from universities which have a long-standing tradition of research. They prefer utilizing the limited funds of the Program for building research resources at institutions where they are now meager. Others suggest that because the doctoral candidate's paramount interest is obtaining his degree, he should be funded at a lower rate than a faculty member whose research is expected to be disseminated in the classroom. These men agree that the Program should give students only "seed" money for facilities and a modest stipend rather than funding them at parity with more experienced researchers.

The analysis of the effects of the research conducted by doctoral candidates, a major interest of this study,[5] hopefully will aid the Program's directors in resolving the dilemma of the place of the doctoral candidate in the Program. Of equal interest in assessing the impact of the RRP is the employment status of applicants, beyond the point of being students. Recall that Table 1.3 showed that nine out of ten applicants are employed at least part-time. The next table (Table 1.5) reports the position of employed applicants at the time proposals were submitted.

TABLE 1.5

TWO-THIRDS OF THE EMPLOYED APPLICANTS ARE FACULTY MEMBERS AT A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY

Position	Proportion of applicants
Faculty member	.66
Research director	.07
Administrative officer	.07
Teacher	.06
Program director	.05
Counselor or consultant	.04
Student assistant or fellow	.04
School administrator	.01
TOTAL	1.00 (596)
NA =	2
Cases excluded*	67
	665

*Applicants not employed.

---

[5] See Chapter Six.

Without a doubt, faculty members are the individuals most likely to apply to the RRP. Of the applicants, only a few are research directors, administrators, school teachers, or other specialists in education.

These same data enable us to examine the extent to which the Program is meeting one of the stated aims, namely:

> To encourage ... research ... so that students may benefit from having professors who are engaged in educational research activities.[6]

The number of applicants among the 392 college or university faculties can be seen in Table 1.6.

TABLE 1.6

ALL FACULTY RANKS ARE REPRESENTED
AMONG APPLICANTS

Faculty rank	Proportion of applicants
Assistant professor	.36
Associate professor	.29
Full professor	.28
Other (e.g., adjunct, lecturer)	.07
TOTAL	1.00 (392)
NA =	2
Cases excluded*	271
	665

*Applicants whose principal position is not that of a faculty member.

Clearly, applicants come from every professorial rank. And, in light of the Program's interest in attracting young researchers to educational research, it is encouraging to note that the highest proportion of these applicants are assistant professors. As one Director of Educational Research put it, "The USOE small grants program seeks to give a chance to the 'little guy' who might otherwise lose out to the pros."

---

[6] Guidelines, loc. cit.

Major Field

Not unexpectedly, the majority of applicants state that their major field is education (Table 1.7).

TABLE 1.7

A MAJORITY OF THE APPLICANTS SPECIALIZE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

Major field		Proportion of applicants
Education		.54
Teacher training	.39	
Administration	.22	
Curriculum	.15	
Research and statistics	.09	
Special education (e.g., adult, business)	.08	
All other subareas in education	.07	
	1.00 (361)	
Psychology		.21
Social science (e.g., sociology, economics)		.11
Mathematics, physical or biological sciences		.05
English and language arts		.05
Other (e.g., music, medicine)		.03
TOTAL		.99 (665)

Within education, those specializing in teacher training or in administration have the highest representation among the applicants. One-fifth of the applicants are in psychology, and most of these researchers pursue one of three sub-specialties, all of which have an educational focus: developmental, guidance and counseling, or learning. In sum, 75 per cent of the applicants are in one of these two major fields.

Highest Degree

Although the largest proportion of applicants specializes in education, this does not mean that a doctorate in education is the prevalent degree. In fact, Table 1.8 shows that among applicants more have a Ph.D. in a discipline than either an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. in education. This table also shows that 40 per cent of the applicants have no more than a master's degree, and 4 per cent have only a bachelor's degree. Thus, the RRP is attracting a group of applicants with relatively heterogeneous academic training. Even though, as Table 1.7 showed, the majority (54 per cent) of proposals are submitted by applicants specializing in the field of education, the near equal number (45 per cent) from persons in the disciplines is fairly strong evidence that the problems of research are being attacked by a broad range of perspectives.

TABLE 1.8

MORE APPLICANTS HAVE EARNED A PH.D. IN A DISCIPLINE THAN EITHER AN ED.D. OR A PH.D. IN EDUCATION

Degree specialty	Highest degree	Proportion of applicants
Discipline	Ph.D.	.24
Education	Ed.D.	.17
Education	Ph.D.	.13
Discipline	M.A. or M.S.	.18
Education	M.Ed., M.A. or M.S.	.22
Discipline	B.A. or B.S.	.02
Education	B.A. or B.S.	.02
	Other degree or professional diploma	.02
	TOTAL	1.00 (660)
	NA =	5
		665

It should also be noted, as Table 1.9 shows, that two out of every three degrees have been awarded since 1960--a finding which only confirms the fact that the Program is reaching young researchers at the beginning of their careers. Of even more interest, is the finding in Table 1.9 that 43 per cent of these applicants have earned their doctorate within the last four years.

TABLE 1.9

TWO OUT OF THREE DOCTORATES
HAVE BEEN EARNED SINCE 1960

Year of degree		Proportion of doctorates
Before 1960		.33
1960 - 1963		.24
1964 - 1967		.43
	TOTAL	1.00 (347)
	Cases excluded*	309
	NA =	9
		665

*Other degree or professional diploma.

We complete this brief description of the applicants studied by reporting a few statistics about their personal and family backgrounds.[7] All but nineteen applicants are white; more than four out of five are married men with either two or three dependents. Typically, they are 38 years old with a median income of $14,000 in 1968 which they expect to reach $16,000 in 1969. Two out of three have parents who did not attend college nor did one-third of these even complete grade school.

Summary

In sum, the Program is attracting men who are on the faculty of an institution of higher education. They are more likely to be junior than senior faculty members, and more likely to have earned a Ph.D.

---

[7] See Appendix B, Tables 1.3-1.10 for the statistics summarized here.

in a discipline than either an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. in education. Finally, the Program has succeeded in reaching young researchers whose primary interest is education, be it degree specialty or current major field. These individuals comprise the majority of the applicants.

CHAPTER TWO

THE SUCCESSFUL APPLICANT

The USOE Regional Research Program (RRP) is based on the principle that individuals with good ideas who are interested in undertaking a small-scale project in educational research will find the Program receptive. The applicant need not be affiliated with a prestigious institution or have a long list of publications to his credit. He must only have researchable ideas with educational significance and be capable of carrying his project to completion.

To anticipate the results of this chapter, to a surprising degree the RRP is a place where the unknown educational researcher can market his idea. Whatever faults the Program may have, the Directors of Educational Research in the nine USOE regions have succeeded in implementing this Program goal. In fact, this goal may be the strongest feature of the Program.

To our knowledge, until this study of the RRP was undertaken, no systematic information about the funding patterns of granting agencies existed.[1] To be sure, foundations and government agencies package attractive annual reports describing their many grant programs. They do not, however, report how many applicants applied for support or what characteristics differentiate the successful from the unsuccessful applicants.

For this reason alone, this study of the RRP should be of interest to the research community. It provides considerable information about the process of sorting applicants into those who are funded and those who are not.

Cooperating Institution

This chapter focuses on the individual and institutional characteristics that identify the funded applicant. Of the 665 applicants, we look first at the institutional characteristics of the 251 who were funded. (In proportions this comes to 0.38 of the applicants.) Moreover, the funding pattern reflects whether the sponsor is an institution of higher education or one of a variety of institutions or organizations not in higher education such as an elementary or secondary school system, a state department of education, or a private firm. As Table 2.1 shows, the applicant whose cooperating institution is a college or university clearly is most likely to be funded.

---

[1] Two descriptive articles have been published on why research proposals are disapproved: Ernest M. Allen, "Why Are Research Grant Applicants Disapproved?" Vol. 132, Science (1960), 1532-1534, and Gerald R. Smith, "A Critique of Proposals Submitted to the Cooperative Research Program," in J. Culbertson and S. Hencley (eds.), Educational Research: New Perspectives (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1963), Ch. 17, 277-287.

TABLE 2.1

COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES SPONSOR THE HIGHEST PROPORTION OF FUNDED APPLICANTS

Cooperating Institution	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
College or university	.40	(560)
School system	.27	(66)
Private agency (e.g., a rehabilitation agency)	.29	(24)
State department of education	[4]	(9)
Other (e.g., private firm, educational association)	[0]	(6)
TOTAL	.38	(665)

Note: Bracketed numbers refer to the actual number of funded applicants where there are too few cases for determining proportions.

The finding that proposals submitted by school systems were least likely to be funded (only 27 per cent) was suggested to us before the results of the applicant survey were tabulated. During our interviews with the Directors of Educational Research, more than one pointed out that the personnel of school systems lack expertise in proposal writing and need individualized assistance to prepare a satisfactory proposal. As one phrased the problem,

> I'd like to have more time to go out there [to school systems], sit down with the research director and his staff and help him. I know they are capable of writing a proposal that could be funded.

To this Director of Educational Research, the school system should be a more important target of the Program because so many graduates of Schools of Education go into the public school system and as staff members, plan curriculum development in a setting where the research skills for evaluating the innovation are often lacking.

The Directors in two other regions remarked that they assign a lower priority to working with school system personnel than with college or university administrators and faculty who are just beginning to develop a research orientation. They reason that more federal money is channeled into elementary and secondary education for evaluation research than into developing institutions of higher education.

Another Director of Educational Research takes a different position. He thinks that for the present it is unrealistic to expect school districts to contribute to research in a major way, at least in his region.

> Only the very largest school systems can afford any kind of research staff. School districts tell me point blank that they just don't have any resources for doing research. State legislation straps them in funds.

In this Director's view, school districts should be utilizers of research and identifiers of problems that need solution, but not researchers, *per se*.

Finally, two others indicated that they do not have specific target populations in their regions. One said:

> I go out after the idea, irrespective of where it comes from.

The other remarked:

> I'm out to identify the potentially good researcher anywhere. I can't be expected to give him training in depth, but I can be expected to open research opportunities to him.

Thus, there is a diversity of opinion among the Directors of Educational Research about encouraging the personnel of school systems to submit proposals to the RRP. At the same time, the structure of many school systems, as well as their internal requirements, probably limit the extent of their participation in a program such as the RRP. The topic of school systems and the RRP, of course, merits a study of its own. Here we only call attention to the fact that for whatever reasons--unofficial policy, preferences of the Directors, or obstacles within school systems--the fact is clear: school systems do not fare as well as colleges and universities in securing funds from the RRP.

Sponsoring Department

From Chapter One we learned that proposals sponsored by a college or university originate most frequently in Schools or Departments of Education. We also know, of course, that these proposals are submitted to conduct research on education. With this information, one might guess that proposals listing a School or Department of Education as the university subdivision would be most likely to be funded. Such is not the case, however, as Table 2.2 shows.

TABLE 2.2

APPLICANTS SPONSORED BY UNIVERSITY RESEARCH BUREAUS ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE FUNDED

Sponsoring Department	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
Research bureau	.53	(38)
Liberal arts department	.40	(176)
Professional school or administrative office	.39	(82)
School or department of education	.38	(264)
TOTAL	.40	(560)
Cases excluded*		105
		(665)

*Not at an institution of higher education.

As may be seen in Table 2.2, research bureaus submit the fewest proposals to the RRP, but it is the applicants sponsored by research bureaus who have the best chance of getting funded.

Perhaps the most important finding in Table 2.2, however, is that the greatest number of applicants for RRP funds are associated with a School or Department of Education, but these applicants are, if anything, slightly less likely to be funded than the smaller number from a liberal arts department or from a professional school. Except for applicants from a research bureau, the difference in funding rate among university subdivisions is so small that it warrants explanation.

Highest Earned Degree

Knowing that the Ph.D. is usually perceived as a research degree and the Ed.D. as oriented toward professional practice, the next step in finding out which applicants are more successful is to explore their academic backgrounds. Because so many applicants had not earned a doctorate when they applied for a grant from the RRP, Table 2.3 reports the proportion of applicants funded by whether their highest degree in 1967[2] was a bachelor's, master's or doctorate.

The figures in Table 2.3 are quite revealing. They show that applicants trained in a discipline, whether holding a doctorate or only a master's degree, are most likely to be funded. To be specific, a total of 43 per cent who have a doctor's or a master's degree in a field other than education submit successful proposals, but only 34 per cent of those with a Ph.D. in education and 30 per cent with a master's in education are funded.

To a leading spokesman for educational research,

> Solid training in one or more of the behavioral, social and humanistic disciplines is indispensable for thoughtful educational research.[3]

Judging by the funding pattern of the RRP, today's talented researcher is recruited to the field of educational research rather than being trained as a researcher while a graduate student specializing in education.

Of particular significance is the ability of the RRP to attract young researchers to educational research, that is, those who have no more than a master's degree in another field. One can assume that these individuals are in an institutional setting that provides contact between the field of education and their own discipline or they would not have thought of applying to the RRP for a small-projects grant. Further analysis of our data will show how many of these 116 applicants intend their proposed research for a doctoral dissertation and the extent to which they are committed to the field of educational research.[4]

---

[2] 1967 is used because this study focuses on applicants who submitted proposals to the RRP between July, 1967 and June, 1968.

[3] Lee J. Cronbach, "The Role of the University in Improving Education," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 47 (June, 1966), 544.

[4] See Chapter Six.

TABLE 2.3

APPLICANTS WITH THE DOCTORATE OR A MASTER'S DEGREE IN A DISCIPLINE ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE FUNDED

Degree specialty	Highest degree	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
Discipline	Ph.D.	.43	(161)
	Master's	.43	(116)
Education	Ed.D.	.40	(112)
	Ph.D.	.34	(83)
	Master's	.30	(147)
	TOTAL	.38	(619)
	Cases excluded*		41
	NA =		5
			665

*Other degree or professional diploma.

One curious finding in Table 2.3 deserves comment: namely, applicants with a Ph.D. in education are somewhat less likely to be funded than those with an Ed.D. (34 per cent of the Ph.D.'s in education and 40 per cent of the Ed.D.'s). We expected just the opposite because Ed.D. graduate programs provide training for teaching and professional service while the Ph.D. graduate programs in education are oriented toward research training.[5] Table 2.4 in the next section of this chapter will help explain this finding by showing that only certain Ph.D.'s in education are less likely than Ed.D.'s to be funded.

---

[5] See Buswell and McConnell study of 1954 and 1964 Ed.D.'s and Ph.D.'s in education for an analysis of the differential training and career activities of these two groups of educational specialists. Guy T. Buswell and T.R. McConnell, Training for Educational Research, Cooperative Research Project No. 51074 (Berkeley, California: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1966).

Previous Research Grants

Research costs money and even the most modest inquiry requires a researcher's time and available supplies. Moreover, most educational research is not an operation that can be undertaken by one individual equipped with no more than a typewriter, a ream of paper, and the kitchen table. Under these circumstances, it is only natural that researchers seek funds to carry out their work.

We purposely asked applicants seeking funds from the RRP whether they had obtained research grants in the past. The question was worded:

> [Prior to applying for a grant from the RRP] have you ever received a research grant from any of the following sources?

Sources ranged from a government agency to the applicant's own institution. Of the researchers funded by the RRP, 43 per cent had never received a previous research grant[6]--evidence that the RRP does give the young researcher a chance to get started.

Does the RRP, however, fund the less experienced researcher regardless of his level of training? In other words, is the Program equally likely to support pre- and post-doctoral applicants? Then too, how does the area of specialization influence the applicant's chances of obtaining support? We know that applicants trained in a discipline are more likely to receive RRP support than those trained in education, but is this still the case when we relate degree specialty and research grant experience to funding?

Table 2.4 answers these questions and adds to our knowledge of who is funded. First, there are differences among those who have previously received a grant and those who have not. In four out of five comparisons, those who have not received a previous grant are more likely to be funded by the RRP than those who have. This finding is shown in the column headed "Difference."

---

[6] Appendix B, Table 2.1

TABLE 2.4

APPLICANTS WHO HAVE NEVER RECEIVED A RESEARCH GRANT ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE FUNDED

Degree specialty	Highest degree	Previous grants				Difference
		None		One or more		
		(Proportion funded)				
Discipline	Ph.D.	.52	(23)	.40	(136)	+.12
	Master's	.54	(65)	.29	(51)	+.25
Education	Ph.D.	.47	(15)	.30	(66)	+.17
	Ed.D.	.36	(25)	.42	(86)	-.06
	Master's	.36	(88)	.21	(56)	+.15
	TOTAL	.44	(216)	.35	(395)	

N = 611
Cases excluded* 41
NA = 13
665

*Other degree or professional diploma.

Second, Table 2.4 shows that more than one half the applicants who have a degree in a discipline obtain their first research grant from the RRP. To be specific, 52 per cent of the applicants with a Ph.D. in a discipline (row 1), and 54 per cent of those with a master's degree in a discipline submit research proposals that are funded. This is an important finding. The Program supports not only unknown researchers, but it also gives as much chance to the pre- as to the postdoctoral applicant from a discipline.

Third, Table 2.4 provides more information about the Ph.D. in education that helps differentiate him from the Ed.D. It is the Ph.D. in education with no other research grant to his credit who is more likely to be a successful RRP applicant than the Ed.D. in the same circumstances. Note, however, that recipients of the research degree in education who have been awarded other grants do not fare so well as RRP applicants--only 30 per cent are funded.

Finally, the funding pattern for the Ed.D., as shown in Table 2.4, is perplexing. Of all the applicants, they are the only group more likely to be funded if they have received a previous grant. The explanation, as we will see shortly, lies in the present field of interest of these applicants.

Earlier, Table 2.2 showed that about the same proportion of applicants from Schools of Education and from liberal arts departments are funded by the RRP. Which applicants in these subdivisions is yet to be explored. Knowing that type of degree distinguishes the funded applicant from the not funded one, we want to consider this characteristic jointly with departmental affiliation to further delineate the recipient of RRP funds. Table 2.5 shows this relationship.

First, we want to mention that the numbers appearing in some of the cells under the headings "Research bureau," "Other subdivision," and "Not in higher education" (the last three columns of Table 2.5) are too small to show a clear pattern. We simply present these data to assure the reader that these applicants have not been overlooked.

The key finding in Table 2.5 is that applicants trained in a discipline who subsequently cross over to Schools or departments of Education are particularly likely to have submitted successful proposals. This is the case for applicants who have either a Ph.D. or a master's degree and especially so for those with only a master's degree. By reading the second row of Table 2.5, we see that 48 per cent of the applicants affiliated with Schools or departments of Education in addition to holding a master's degree in a discipline are funded, whereas only 38 per cent of those with the same type of degree but in liberal arts departments are successful.

Conversely, the few applicants with a Ph.D. in education who move into liberal arts departments are more likely to be funded than their more numerous peers with an identical degree who have remained in Schools or departments of Education.

From the figures in Table 2.5 one cannot draw the conclusion that researchers trained in one area who then become affiliated with another are necessarily better researchers. But the data do suggest that these men are in departments free of traditional barriers or they wouldn't have been recruited in the first place. For instance, the applicant with a Ph.D. in a discipline attached to a School of Education is a prime example of how some Schools of Education develop communication with relevant disciplines. Further research would be needed to learn whether, in general, investigators trained in one field who are recruited to another offer promise as researchers. However, we can say that among the applicants, those trained in a discipline who are attracted to Schools of Education merit study as a manpower resource for developing educational research.

TABLE 2.5

APPLICANTS TRAINED IN A DISCIPLINE BUT AFFILIATED WITH A SCHOOL OF EDUCATION ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE FUNDED

Degree specialty	Highest degree	Affiliation: Higher Education				Not in higher education
		School of education	Liberal arts	Research bureau	Other subdivision	
		(Proportion funded)				
Discipline	Ph.D.	.52 (23)	.48 (90)	.43 (14)	.26 (23)	.18 (11)
	Master's	.48 (29)	.38 (48)	[3] (3)	.52 (21)	.26 (15)
Education	Ed.D.	.43 (73)	[0] (7)	[5] (7)	.36 (11)	.36 (14)
	Ph.D.	.33 (52)	.45 (11)	[2] (4)	[3] (10)	[1] (6)
	Master's	.30 (79)	.23 (13)	[2] (7)	.38 (13)	.29 (35)
	TOTAL	.38 (256)	.41 (169)	.51 (35)	.37 (78)	.27 (81)

N = 619
Cases excluded* 41
NA = 5
665

*Other degree or professional diploma.

Note: Bracketed numbers refer to the actual number of funded applicants where there are too few cases for determining proportions.

Most Ed.D.'s, as one would expect, are affiliated with Schools or departments of Education. Moreover, as applicants for RRP funds they are more successful than their colleagues with Ph.D.'s in education who have the same type of affiliation. Forty-three per cent of the Ed.D.'s in contrast to 33 per cent of the Ph.D.'s who specialize in education are funded. Why Ed.D.'s are more likely to be successful leads directly into the next, and last, section of this chapter which focuses on the applicant's field of interest at the time he submitted his proposal.

Major Field

Every applicant who completed our questionnaire was asked to designate his major field or specialty at the time he submitted his proposal to the RRP. Not unexpectedly (as shown in Table 1.7) a majority of applicants designated education. The second most frequently listed specialty was psychology. Together these two fields included 75 per cent of the applicants. The remaining 25 per cent were in a variety of fields ranging from art to zoology.

The fact that applicants more often than not are in some branch of education does not necessarily mean that they are the ones who are funded. On the contrary, psychologists are most likely to submit winning proposals, as may be seen in Table 2.6.

TABLE 2.6

PSYCHOLOGISTS ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE FUNDED
THAN SPECIALISTS IN ANY OTHER FIELD

Major field	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
Psychology	.45	(143)
Education	.35	(361)
Social science (e.g., sociology, economics)	.35	(74)
All other fields	.38	(87)
TOTAL	.38	(665)

Applicants in education specified the sub-area of interest within their major field--for example, administration, teacher training, or research and statistics. Applicants in psychology did likewise, naming developmental psychology, guidance and counseling, or another subspecialty.

Now we want to consider the funding patterns of the RRP taking into account the subspecialty of the many applicants in psychology or education. Doing so will further differentiate the applicants and, as we will see shortly, explain a seemingly paradoxical finding shown in Tables 2.3 and 2.5: Ed.D.'s, the recipients of a doctorate oriented toward professional practice, are more likely to be funded than Ph.D.'s in education, the recipients of the research oriented degree.

Within psychology, it is the applicant who specializes in learning or developmental who is most likely to obtain RRP funds (Table 2.7 below). Then, within the field of education, the applicant who specializes in teacher training or administration is more likely to be funded. Parenthetically, we might add that more applicants come from these two subspecialties than any other, as can be seen from the figures entered in the last column of Table 2.7.

An applicant's degree and his major field of interest are, of course, closely related. One trained in education tends to work in that field, and one trained in a discipline tends to stay within his discipline. But the story is not so simple. We know from Table 2.5 that applicants with a Ph.D. in a discipline who switch to a School of Education are especially likely to be funded for a small-projects grant. We then began to consider whether these Ph.D.'s name psychology or a branch of education as their major field of interest.

Moreover, throughout this discussion of funding patterns we have found the Ph.D. in education an enigma. In general, he is less likely to secure RRP funds than the Ed.D. The exception is the very few (11 cases) who switch to liberal arts. These applicants have a high funding rate; all the others lag behind the Ed.D.'s, as shown in Table 2.5.

In an effort to explain why almost all Ph.D.'s in education do poorly relative to Ed.D.'s in education as competitors for RRP funds, we decided to explore the field of interest of applicants with a doctorate. We have learned, for example, that applicants in some areas of education, notably teacher training and administration, are more likely to be funded than those in other educational sub-areas. We began to think we should find out who these applicants are--Ed.D.'s or Ph.D.'s in education, or perhaps even Ph.D.'s trained in a discipline.

As it turns out, this exploration was rewarding. The results of jointly relating type of doctorate and sub-area of interest to the probability of being funded are presented in Table 2.8. Admittedly,

TABLE 2.7

FUNDING WITHIN PSYCHOLOGY AND WITHIN EDUCATION VARIES BY SUB-AREA

Sub-area within psychology or education	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants	
Psychology			
Learning	.56	(23)	
Developmental	.55	(20)	
Educational	.50	(14)	
Guidance and counseling	.40	(48)	
Personality	[4]	(9)	
Testing and measurement	[3]	(7)	
Clinical	[3]	(7)	
All other subspecialties	.33	(15)	
TOTAL	.45		(143)
Education			
Teacher training	.40	(142)	
Administration	.40	(78)	
Research and statistics	.32	(34)	
Curriculum	.27	(55)	
Special education (e.g., adult, business)	.25	(28)	
All other subspecialties	.25	(24)	
TOTAL	.35		(361)
		N =	504
		Cases excluded*	161
			665

*Applicants in other fields.

Note: Bracketed numbers refer to the actual number of funded applicants where there are too few cases for determining proportions.

TABLE 2.8

PH.D.'S TRAINED IN EDUCATION ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE FUNDED WHEN THEIR FIELD IS PSYCHOLOGY

Major field	Type of doctorate: Ph.D. in education	Ph.D. in a discipline	Ed.D.	
	(Proportion funded)			
Psychology				
Developmental, learning, testing and measurement	[5] (6)	.58 (31)	[0] (3)	
Guidance and counseling, personality	[3] (9)	[2] (8)	.46 (13)	
Educational	[2] (4)	[0] (1)	[2] (3)	
Other (e.g., clinical, social)	[1] (3)	.38 (16)	[1] (1)	
TOTAL	.50 (22)	.46 (56)	.45 (20)	
				N = 98
Education				
Teacher training	.24 (29)	.59 (17)	.39 (36)	
Administration	[0] (5)	[0] (3)	.45 (22)	
Research and statistics	[2] (8)	[3] (5)	.50 (10)	
Curriculum	.45 (11)	[0] (1)	.32 (19)	
TOTAL	.26 (53)	.50 (26)	.40 (87)	

N = 163
Cases excluded* 404
665

---

*Applicants with another degree or a professional diploma who are now in the field of education or psychology (N = 243) and applicants in other fields (N = 161).

Note: Bracketed numbers refer to the actual number of funded applicants in a field when there are too few cases for determining proportions.

there are relatively few cases, but the findings are suggestive.

Comparing the total number of discipline trained Ph.D.'s in the field of education with the ones in psychology, we see that they are about equally likely to be successful. Fifty per cent of those Ph.D.'s now working in education are funded as are 46 per cent of those in psychology. Making the same comparison for Ed.D.'s, we see that whether they are interested in education or psychology, they are also about equally likely to be funded--40 per cent in education, and 45 per cent in psychology are successful. However, the percentages for the Ph.D.'s trained in education diverge considerably. Most are interested in education, but only 26 per cent of them are funded. By contrast, the few now in psychology have a good chance of being funded--exactly 50 per cent.

Studying the lower part of Table 2.8, namely, the section headed "Education," we can trace in more detail the funding trend of applicants with the three types of doctorates in the sub-areas within education. The principal finding here is that in the sub-area teacher training, the Ph.D. in education is no match for the Ed.D. or the Ph.D. trained in a discipline. The Ph.D. from a discipline also knowledgeable in the area of teacher training gets funded with relative ease--59 per cent, to be precise. The Ed.D. ranks second--39 per cent are funded. However, the Ph.D. in education who identifies himself as specializing in teacher training appears to be a loser--his funding rate is only 24 per cent.

We did not attempt to gather data on graduate experience; hence, we cannot say if this contributes to the percentage differences we see in Table 2.8 among funded applicants who specialize in teacher training. We will keep this finding in mind as we proceed with the analysis, but unfortunately, the questionnaire data do not provide a ready answer.

For the few applicants in the field of educational administration, the figures point in the same direction as those discussed above. Forty-five per cent of the Ed.D.'s in educational administration are funded; but none of the Ph.D.'s--whether from a discipline or education. The field of educational administration has been preempted by the Ed.D.'s applying to the RRP.

In brief, our data suggest that the applicant with a Ph.D. in a discipline has the universal degree. He can switch to the field of education or remain in a discipline (typically, psychology) and submit a proposal for educational research that has the best chance of being funded by the RRP. The Ed.D. is not as likely to be funded as the Ph.D. from a discipline when both designate education as the major field. The few Ed.D.'s who cross over into psychology fare as well as their colleagues from the disciplines as recipients of RRP funds. The Ph.D. in education, however, has an uneven rate of success.

Only those in psychology are likely to be funded.

Summary

Overall, this chapter has shown that the RRP invests considerably in the less experienced researcher. A stated aim of the Program is to support promising researchers who seek to undertake a small-scale project in educational research, and the data show that to a considerable extent the Program succeeds in this aim.

In particular, our data indicate that the funded applicant can have a master's degree or a doctorate and be in almost any field, although his chances of being funded are maximal if he is in psychology. Moreover, the funded applicant is usually a novice in obtaining research grants. For example, he is more likely never to have received a research grant than to have a grant or two to his credit.

CHAPTER THREE

THE PROPOSAL

The one means the applicant has of communicating with the reviewers who will evaluate his research plan is through the proposal. The Guidelines caution "... if it [the proposal] does not convey the message, staff and field readers will not assume meaning or intent."[1] As the contents of the proposals are examined, it will become apparent that all too often this caution has not been heeded. For the purpose of this discussion, the contents of the proposals are divided into six sections:

1. Subject matter
2. Educational level
3. Group to be studied
4. Research design
5. Modes of analysis
6. Budget

Subject Matter

An aim of the USOE Regional Research Program (RRP) is to stimulate research on education, and the Program has elicited proposals for studies which go far beyond the usual subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Virtually every field is represented,[2] even those with seemingly remote connections to education. The following randomly selected titles suggest the range and richness of subject matter:

"Biomechanics of Normal and Treadmill Running"

"Photographic Study of Nonverbal Responses in Youth"

"Discrimination of Recency in Children";

"Assaultive Language Usage Reveals Level of Self-Worth Among Ghetto Negro Teen-Agers in Group Situations--An Exploratory Study"

"Nonverbal Communication--Attitude Change and Hierarchical Roles."

---

[1] Guidelines, op. cit., p. 3.

[2] See Appendix B, Table 3.1 for detailed classification of subject matter.

As may be seen in Table 3.1, the distribution of subject matter falls into three main groups: psychology (30 per cent), education (27 per cent) and a conglomerate of less frequently chosen subjects (44 per cent). The two major classifications--psychology and education--have been used here as a means of differentiating education as a psychological process of learning from education as an institution.

TABLE 3.1

THE SUBJECT MATTER OF PROPOSALS

Subject of proposed research	Proportion of proposals
Psychology (education as a process)	.30
Education (education as an institution)	.27
Mathematics, physical, or biological sciences	.15
English and language arts	.13
Social sciences other than psychology	.10
Music or art	.06
TOTAL	1.01 (651)
Subject not elsewhere classified (e.g., aviation)	11
Not classifiable by subject (e.g., student activism)	3
	665

*Tables in this chapter compare the funded and the not funded proposal only when the data show a difference between these two groups.

Within each field, the subspecialty provides a more precise definition of the subject matter to be examined in the study. For example, within psychology it may be educational psychology, testing and measurement, counseling, or guidance and placement. Within education, the specific area may be administration, finance, or history, or philosophy of education.

Apart from the fact that the few proposals from the fields of music and art have a slightly higher funding rate than proposals from other fields, there is no apparent difference in the funding pattern by subject matter (Table 3.2).

TABLE 3.2

A VARIETY OF SUBJECT MATTERS ARE FUNDED

Subject of proposed research	Proportion of proposals funded	Number of proposals
Music and art	.46	(37)
Mathematics, physical or biological sciences	.40	(97)
Social sciences other than psychology	.40	(66)
Psychology	.38	(193)
Education	.36	(173)
English and language arts	.35	(85)
TOTAL	.38	(651)
Subject not elsewhere classified (e.g., aviation)		11
Not classifiable by subject (e.g., student activism)		3
		665

---

*Tables in this chapter compare the funded and the not funded proposal only when the data show a difference between these two groups.

Proposals in psychology and in education, which together total almost sixty per cent of all submissions, are equally likely to be funded. So too are the proposals in mathematics, English or one of the other social sciences. In sum, for proporals with these different subject matters, the difference between the minimum and maximum funding rate is only 5 per cent.

Educational Level

As Table 3.3 shows, the educational levels to be studied extend from pre-school to higher education. The studies concentrate on the elementary and secondary schools, which taken together are mentioned as the level of interest in 56 per cent of the proposals. The post-secondary levels are the anticipated focus of attention in over one-half of the studies (51 per cent); but for this group of proposals, the four year college is the level most frequently included in the research plan (37 per cent).

TABLE 3.3

LEVEL OF EDUCATION TO BE STUDIED

Educational level to be studied		Proportion of proposals
Pre-school		.07
Lower levels		
Elementary	.28	.56
Secondary	.28	
Higher levels		
College	.37	.51
Junior college	.06	
Vocational	.05	
Graduate	.03	
Entire school system		.01
TOTAL		1.15* (517)
Educational level not specified		59
Not applicable		89
		665

*Total exceeds 1.00 because more than one educational level will be studied.

Group to Be Studied

Considering the fact that there is a $10,000 ceiling on RRP projects, it is not unexpected that students lead the list of groups to be studied (Table 3.4).

TABLE 3.4

SEVEN OUT OF TEN PROPOSALS SPECIFY THAT STUDENTS WILL BE STUDIED

Group to be studied	Proportion of proposals
Students	.69
Teachers	.14
Schools	.06
Principals	.03
Community	.02
School district	.01
Parents	.01
Guidance counselors	.01
Other (e.g., employers, citizens, taxpayers)	.15
TOTAL	1.12* (543)
Not applicable	122
	665

*Total exceeds 1.00 because more than one group will be studied.

It is less expensive to administer, for example, standard tests to captive classes of students than to research other groups.

As may be seen in Table 3.4, 69 per cent of RRP proposals focus on students. Researchers seldom simultaneously include teachers, as evidenced by the 55 point difference in the proportions. Of course, not all 14 per cent of the teacher groups are paired with students. Teachers themselves are studied separately. Other roles directly connected with the educative process are almost completely overlooked. The school as a whole has a better chance (6 per cent) of being studied than principals (3 per cent), parents (1 per cent) and guidance counselors (1 per cent).

Although the Guidelines state that applicants are "... to outline the proposed research procedures carefully,"[3] our efforts to classify the contents of proposals reveal that many do not. Of the 377 applicants planning to study students, 34 per cent fail to specify even a rough estimate of the sample size.[4] Only 9 per cent have anything to say about the race or ethnicity of students,[5] and only 10 per cent define the economic level of students.[6]

---

[3] Guidelines, loc. cit.

When teachers are subjects--the one remaining school group with much probability of being studied--the applicants are more negligent of details. Approximate sample size is not given in 55 per cent of the cases.[7] These figures suggest the magnitude of the omissions of basic factual information in proposals.

Research Design

Applicants select a variety of designs to achieve the objectives of their proposed projects. As Table 3.5 shows, they most frequently use:

1. Experiments or quasi-experiments
2. Surveys
3. Standardized achievement or psychological tests
4. Tests developed for the study.

The subject matter of a study influences the choice of design. Studies in psychology, English, mathematics, the physical sciences, music, and art rely most on standardized tests or tests developed for the research; studies in education or a social science other than psychology are particularly likely to use surveys (Table 3.6).

Of greater interest, perhaps, is the absence of empty cells in Table 3.6. Each research design is used by a fair share of the researchers in every area. A comparison of the columns for psychology and education illustrates both the influence of subject matter on design choice and the variation of choice within a subject area. For example, 88 per cent of the studies in psychology use standardized tests; 45 per cent, experiments; 32 per cent, a survey; 18 per cent, observational or developmental techniques; and 16 per cent another design. In education, the survey is preferred (47 per cent); then observational or developmental techniques (38 per cent); standardized tests (31 per cent); another design (26 per cent); and last, experiments (23 per cent).

---

[4] Appendix B, Table 3.2.

[5] Appendix B, Table 3.3.

[6] Appendix B, Table 3.4.

[7] Appendix B, Table 3.5.

TABLE 3.5

THE STUDY DESIGNS OF PROPOSALS VARY CONSIDERABLY

Study design	Proportion of proposals
Experiment, quasi-experiment	.36
Survey (questionnaires, interviews)	.35
Standardized achievement or psychological tests	.32
Tests developed for the study (e.g., aptitude, personality, achievement, etc.)	.28
Developmental design (e.g., for a curriculum innovation)	.16
Documentary or secondary analysis	.16
Observation	.14
Other (e.g., sociometry, case study)	.06
TOTAL	1.83* (649)
Not specified or not applicable	16
	665

*Total exceeds 1.00 because more than one study design was specified.

Modes of Analysis

The many ways that applicants intend to analyze their data are detailed in Table 3.7. One-third of those who do specify the modes of analysis plan to rely on tests of significance; another 31 per cent, analysis of variance; and 28 per cent, correlation or regression analysis. For the remaining quantitative techniques the proportions drop sharply, reflecting an inverse relationship between complexity of technique and frequency of use.

The disquieting element in Table 3.7 is the number of omissions. Twenty-seven per cent do not state any plans for analyzing the data. In this instance, the instructions in the Guidelines may be a factor. Applicants are not explicitly instructed to describe the planned modes of analysis in the study design section of their proposals. When the Guidelines are revised, this oversight should be corrected. But the

TABLE 3.6

A VARIETY OF STUDY DESIGNS IS USED WITHIN EACH SUBJECT AREA

Study design	Subject of proposed research					
	Psychology	English and language arts	Math and science	Music and art	Other social sciences	Education
Standardized tests or tests developed for study	.88	.76	.64	.50	.35	.31
Experiment	.45	.50	.43	.32	.18	.23
Survey	.32	.21	.21	.32	.52	.47
Observation or developmental	.18	.27	.34	.35	.33	.38
All other designs	.16	.12	.20	.24	.32	.26
TOTALS*	1.99 (192)	1.86 (84)	1.82 (95)	1.73 (34)	1.70 (63)	1.65 (167)

N =	635
Not specified or not applicable	30
	665

*Totals exceed 1.00 because more than one design was indicated.

TABLE 3.7

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ARE THE MOST FREQUENTLY NAMED MODES OF ANALYSIS

Modes of analysis	Proportion of proposals
Tests of significance (e.g., t tests, chi-square)	.33
Analysis of variance	.31
Correlation or regression analysis	.28
Descriptive-nonanalytic analysis	.19
Qualitative or historical analysis	.17
Analysis of covariance	.12
Factor analysis; cluster analysis	.08
Discriminant function analysis	.02
Other (e.g., item analysis, systems analysis)	.05
TOTAL	1.55* (417)
Not specified	169
Not applicable	79
	665

*Total exceeds 1.00 because more than one mode of analysis was planned.

absence of a specific instruction, however, does not justify the high proportion of applicants omitting a discussion of the analytical techniques to be used.

To some extent, one missing detail leads to another. Many applicants fail to state how they intend to process their data. As Table 3.8 shows, this is the case for 246 of the 665 applicants (37 per cent). Virtually all applicants who do specify the intended data processing technique will use a computer.

Budget

The present ceiling on USOE funds for RRP-supported research is $10,000, and most applicants plan with this as the target. Table 3.9

TABLE 3.8

PROPOSALS THAT SPECIFY THE MODES OF DATA PROCESSING BUDGET FOR USE OF A COMPUTER

Modes of computation and data processing	Proportion of proposals
Computer	.98
Other (e.g., McBee cards, hand tabulating)	.02
TOTAL	1.00 (340)
Not specified	246
Not applicable	79
	665

TABLE 3.9

THREE OUT OF FIVE APPLICANTS REQUEST THE MAXIMUM IN FEDERAL FUNDS

Federal contribution requested	Proportion of applicants
$5,000 or less	.11
$5,001 - $7,000	.11
$7,001 - $9,000	.19
$9,001 - $10,000	.59
TOTAL	1.00 (664)
No budget attached to proposal	1
	665

shows that 59 per cent of the proposals specify a federal budget between $9,000 and $10,000. In contrast, only 11 per cent request $5,000 or less. The fact that even this many researchers are able to conduct a project on such a modest budget raises the question of who they are.

It turns out that they are the applicants who intend using their projects for dissertations. A majority of this group request the lower levels of support (Table 3.10).

TABLE 3.10

LESS THAN ONE-HALF OF THE PROPOSALS INTENDED FOR DISSERTATIONS REQUEST MAXIMUM FEDERAL FUNDS

Requested federal contribution	RRP proposal for a dissertation	
	Yes	No
$5,000 or less	.16	.09
$5,001 - $7,000	.15	.10
$7,001 - $9,000	.22	.18
$9,001 - $10,000	.47	.63
TOTALS	1.00 (159)	1.00 (505)

N = 664

No budget attached to proposal 1

665

Only 47 per cent of the applicants who intend their RRP research for dissertations request between $9,000 and $10,000 in federal funds, whereas 63 per cent of those who do not intend their research for dissertations request this amount. Doctoral candidates seem to anticipate that the size of their requests may influence their chances of being funded.

Arriving at a total sum to request is just one aspect of preparing a budget. The utilization of research dollars for specific items is also of interest. The budgets submitted in fiscal 1968 list the portion of the anticipated cost for each item that will be covered by either federal or local funds. However, there is no standard method for distributing funds from the two sources; and in effect, applicants are free to divide the costs as they choose so long as the request for federal funds does not exceed $10,000. For instance, the cooperating institution may assume the total cost of personnel, or computer time, or even indirect costs. Such arrangements produce the illusion that these items are cost-free if only the federal side of the ledger is reviewed. Accordingly, total costs are the basis for the analysis.

Treating each budget item as a total results in the loss of cases. Only 571 of the 665 budgets contain the information necessary for analysis. Eighty-one budgets have been eliminated because they do not state the local contribution,[8] and another thirteen could not be included because the budgets had become separated from the proposals. The available data are reported in Table 3.11; first, as the median cost of the item, followed by the proportion of the 571 budgets upon which the calculation is based.

The magnitude of the median cost at the top of the list--that for professional personnel--stresses its importance. All other direct costs are mere fractions of this amount and none reaches $1,000. Furthermore, it is the only project item appearing in every budget. Even items such as services and supplies, expected to be common among all projects, have not been reported by every applicant. But these variations reflect different accounting procedures at cooperating institutions.[9]

The median total budget is $11,195, several hundred dollars over the amount provided by a maximum federal grant combined with the minimum local contribution. This is only the half-way point in the distribution, 50 per cent of the total costs exceed this amount with a few going as high as $50,000--and even higher. An applicant receiving such strong support can choose among a greater number of alternatives in planning his project than the applicant who has no more than a 5 per cent commitment from his institution. Although this minimum standard for the local contribution is generally enforced, a maximum is not. Setting a maximum would tend to place more equal demands on the researchers.

---

[8] In Fiscal 1968 this information was a required part of the budget and application form; however, the procedure has been modified since that time. The local contribution is now being negotiated after a project has been approved for funding. There is no indication of the anticipated institutional commitment on either the title page or budget of each proposal submitted. Without this information, the true costs of the project are obscured; and in the present analysis, such omissions have resulted in a heavy loss of cases--the federal budget alone does not represent the total cost of the project.

[9] During the coding of the budget data, it was observed that data processing, including coding and key punching, is frequently under services rather than non-professional personnel and services. Indirect costs is another item applicants treat in different ways. Some do not use the category at all and instead apportion such costs among other categories.

TABLE 3.11

THE MEDIAN TOTAL COSTS OF BUDGET ITEMS

Budget item*	Median amount**	Proportion of cases reporting item as a cost
Direct costs		
Professional personnel	$5,578	1.00
Non-professional personnel	782	.80
Services and final report	609	.95
Equipment	590	.29
Travel	420	.77
Employee benefits	374	.80
Supplies and materials	276	.95
Communications	90	.67
Indirect costs	2,152	.91
MEDIAN TOTAL BUDGET	$11,195	1.00
Source of funds		
Local contribution	$2,104	1.00
Federal request	9,257	1.00
TOTAL		(571)

*Cumulative proportions for each item appear in Appendix B, Table 3.6.

**Cases not listing the cost for an item have been eliminated from the distribution.

If it is desirable to equalize the funds available for conducting the research and to limit the Program to truly small projects, then one other factor has to be taken into account. As Table 3.11 shows, the only other item in addition to professional personnel costs that absorbs a high proportion of the budget is indirect costs. This amount, $2,152 represents about 20 per cent of the median budget. Table 3.12 summarizes the per cent of the total budget absorbed by this cost.[10] For 18 per cent

---

[10] Indirect costs are not calculated in a uniform manner by all institutions. To compensate for this variability, indirect cost proportions have been recalculated using the total cost of the project as

TABLE 3.12

PER CENT OF BUDGET FOR INDIRECT COSTS VARIES

Per cent of budget for indirect costs	Proportion of proposals submitted	
10 per cent or less	.18	
11 - 15 per cent	.16	
16 - 20 per cent	.20	
21 - 25 per cent	.19	
26 - 30 per cent	.17	
31 per cent and over	.10	
TOTAL	1.00	(508)
None listed		63
No budget available		13
No local amount stated		81
		665

of the projects, indirect costs represent no more than 10 per cent of the available funds, but for 10 per cent of the projects, indirect costs amount to more than 30 per cent of the budget. The variations in the rates may be partly due to the types of charges entered as indirect costs. More important, they exaggerate differences in total project costs and as a consequence, diminish the amount of the federal grant available for conducting the research. In effect, not all researchers receiving $10,000 grants obtain equal amounts of project support. Under the circumstances, the Directors should consider providing a grant exclusively for the research and then arrange to reimburse the institution for furnishing essential services.

---

the base. This sum is the most reliable figure available; the definitions of item categories have not been standardized and prohibit using total professional costs or total salaries and wages as the denominator.

Summary

This chapter has described the proposals submitted by RRP applicants by presenting data concerning the subject matter, the educational level to be studied, the group to be studied, the research design, the modes of analysis, and the budget. In brief, these data show that the subject matter of RRP proposals is varied. The elementary and secondary levels are most frequently studied; students are the most popular object of proposed research. Few projects center on the teacher, and virtually none on policy-makers, either chief administrators or members of the board.

Every subject is explored in a number of ways. All recognized design techniques are used. However, applicants who utilize the more conventional quantitative modes of analysis far outweigh those relying on qualitative methods. Even though most state that their data will be processed by a computer, few depend upon complex statistical or mathematical programs for the analysis.

The median total budget is $11,195. Only one-half of the projects can be conducted for less than this amount, the assumed small-scale range. The other half exceed $11,195 and a few projects reach $50,000.

The primary finding, however, in this review of the proposals is the consistent failure of applicants to provide sufficient details about their proposed projects. One-third of the applicants planning to study students do not estimate sample size; one-fourth of the applicants do not state plans for analyzing the data; one-third do not specify how they will process the data; and one out of six do not prepare their budgets as required. The omission of this vital information negates efforts to evaluate projects. Furthermore, if only the federal portion of the budget is submitted, the actual costs of the proposed research can never be known and in a sense, the projects cannot be compared on an equal dollar basis.

CHAPTER FOUR

DEVELOPING THE PROPOSAL

Beyond the instruction booklet issued by a granting agency, an applicant seeking funds for his research usually likes to sound out his ideas and obtain some appraisal of his plan before he formally approaches an agency. He may do this, for example, by discussing his proposed research with a colleague. The exchange can lead to other sources, such as an overlooked article, a contact with someone who has applied for a similar grant, or a substantive specialist who is willing to go over a draft of the proposal. These examples suggest that much can happen between the time a researcher first thinks of applying for a grant and finally transmits his proposal.

How to write a research proposal is, of course, easier said than done. The USOE Regional Research Program (RRP) Guidelines, urge the applicant to be "clear, concise, forthright, and complete,"[1] an injunction which applies to all expository writing. But how one achieves the desired degree of perfection is not explained. Hopefully, documenting the experiences of applicants will be instructive for those contemplating submitting a proposal, for the RRP, and for scientists interested in the process of sorting the ideas that get researched from those that are aborted.

In this section we will consider how applicants hear of the RRP, at what point in time their research plans are formulated, and the type of resources they use in preparing the proposal. Lastly, we will discuss the housekeeping aspects of proposal development: the clerical costs, who bears the expense, and the number of man-hours spent preparing the proposal.

Finding Out About the RRP

Since our sample is composed of educational researchers applying to only one granting program and does not include researchers in general, we cannot gauge the number of potential applicants. We do know, however, how several hundred learned about the Program. Indeed, as Table 4.1 shows, sources of knowledge about the Program are varied: (1) word of mouth from a colleague or superior; (2) personal contact with a USOE official; (3) oral presentation or written materials prepared by agency personnel; and (4) announcements in professional publications.

---

[1] Guidelines, op. cit., p. 4.

TABLE 4.1

APPLICANTS LEARN ABOUT THE RRP FROM A COLLEAGUE OR SUPERIOR

Source of knowledge about RRP	Proportion of applicants[*]
Colleague; superior; dean	.64
Personal contact with USOE official	.12
Oral presentation by USOE official or USOE written materials	.10
CORD (Consortium Research Development)	.02
Other (e.g., AERA Newsletter)	.07
Cannot recall	.10
TOTAL	1.05[**]
	(658)
NA =	7
	665

[*] Tables in this chapter compare the funded and the not funded applicant, only when the data show a difference between these two groups.

[**] Total exceeds 1.00 because each applicant could name more than one source.

As may be seen in Table 4.1 applicants are likely to hear about the Program from a colleague or superior.

A chief reason for regionalizing the Small-Projects Program is to enable direct contact between USOE personnel and potential applicants, as well as between the Directors of Educational Research and the funded researcher. All of the Directors of Educational Research agree that "going into the field," as they put it, is one of their most important functions; but as they told us, the scarcity of funds severely limits this type of activity. For example, one remarked, "In this region ... there has been a constant freeze on travel for the three years that I have been here." It is quite likely that only a limited number of applicants learn about the RRP from a USOE official because of travel freezes.

C4

Formulating a Research Plan and Applying for Funds

News of available funds from a granting agency may serve as a stimulus to the potential applicant for generating an idea into a research plan, or it may prompt him to move ahead with the plan he has been working on so that he can apply for support immediately. Applicants for RRP funds are in the latter category; that is, they state that they had a well-defined research plan before they thought of applying to the RRP.

To be precise, as can be seen in Table 4.2 below, 544 out of 658 applicants (83 per cent) had formulated research plans prior to thinking of submitting a proposal to the RRP. Correlating the time the research idea was formulated with the disposition of the proposal, we find that the early formulators are the ones being funded (40 per cent). This finding suggests that the RRP provides support for promising research ideas waiting to be tested. Without RRP, these ideas might remain in the mind of the researcher--and, in a sense, become lost knowledge.

TABLE 4.2

APPLICANTS WITH WELL-DEFINED RESEARCH PLANS BEFORE THEY THINK OF APPLYING TO RRP ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE FUNDED

Stage of research plans and timing of application	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
Well-defined before thinking of applying	.40	(544)
Only general idea before thinking of applying	.30	(93)
Developed research plans after thinking of applying	.24	(21)
TOTAL	.38	(658)
NA =		7
		665

Proposals, just as journal articles, can make the rounds. Thus, it is plausible that many applicants submit their proposals to other agencies before taking them to the RRP. However, we know that relatively few applicants had, in fact, gone elsewhere.

The applicant questionnaire contained the following item:

> Had you previously submitted a similar proposal to a funding agency?
>
> (Item #12)

The figures in Table 4.3 show that four out of five applicants had not done so.

TABLE 4.3

FEWER THAN ONE IN FIVE APPLICANTS SUBMITTED A SIMILAR PROPOSAL TO ANOTHER FUNDING AGENCY

Similar proposal submitted to another agency?		Proportion of applicants
No		.83
Yes		.17
	TOTAL	1.00 (661)
	NA =	4
		665

Here we have another piece of evidence that the RRP provides support for those interested in research on education, but who have not tried to market their plans elsewhere.

Resources

No matter how well-defined a research plan may be, when an applicant prepares the proposal it is helpful to have supplementary materials at hand. As a minimum he needs printed materials from the granting agency. This may seem too obvious to mention; but, as we shall see, not every applicant has this essential information. Then, if the applicant is inexperienced in proposal writing, he may find it helpful to have copies of proposals submitted by other researchers to which he can refer. Finally, even those with experience find it useful to consult someone knowledgeable about granting agencies regarding a time-schedule and budget.

Applicants were asked about both the resources available at their institutions and the resources they used while preparing their proposals. The answer options were presented as a check-list. Table 4.4

shows the items listed as well as the proportion of applicants who have each resource available.

TABLE 4.4

USOE "GUIDELINES" AND A "RESOURCE PERSON" ARE AVAILABLE TO MOST APPLICANTS

Resources available	Proportion of applicants
1. USOE "Guidelines for Small Project Research"	.87
2. A "resource person" knowledgeable about applying for research funds	.72
3. Copies of proposals submitted by others	.45
4. Sample application forms of funding agencies	.44
5. An "information bank" of agencies that fund research	.40
6. ERIC materials	.33
7. USOE "Winning a Research Bid: Tips on Proposal Writing"	.10
TOTAL	3.31* (621)
No resources available	31
NA =	13
	665

*Total exceeds 1.00 because each applicant could name more than one resource.

Approximately three resources are available for each applicant. The USOE "Guidelines for Small Project Research" is at the top of the list, but it is worth noting that 13 per cent of the applicants do not have this reference available. Next in line is a resource person knowledgeable about research procedures: 72 per cent of the applicants are at institutions which have such a person for consultation about application procedures. Notice too that at the bottom of Table 4.4 there is a line reading "No resources available"; 5 per cent of the applicants are in this resource-poor group--not one of the seven resources is available to them.

When we consider which of the available resources are actually used, we have a measure of their relative importance as an aid to the researcher in the preparation of a proposal. Moreover, these same data suggest which resources should be available at every institution.

Table 4.4 showed that the USOE "Guidelines" and a "resource person" are available to most applicants, and Table 4.5 below reveals that almost every applicant having access to these resources puts them to use.

TABLE 4.5

APPLICANTS SELECTIVELY UTILIZE RESOURCES

Resources utilized	Proportion of applicants utilizing resource	Number of applicants with resource	
1. USOE "Guidelines for Small Project Research"	.95	(544)	
2. A "resource person" knowledgeable about applying for research funds	.89	(447)	
3. Copies of proposals submitted by others	.82	(281)	
4. Sample application forms of funding agencies	.75	(272)	
5. USOE "Winning a Research Bid: Tips on Proposal Writing"	.67	(67)	
6. An "information bank" of agencies that fund research	.56	(249)	
7. ERIC materials	.48	(205)	
	Number of applicant responses	(2065)*	
	Number of applicants using at least one resource		597
	Number of applicants using no resources		55
	NA =		13
			665

*Number of responses exceeds number of applicants because many applicants used more than one resource.

More interesting, perhaps, is the finding also in Table 4.5 that 82 per cent of the applicants review proposals written by someone else in their search for help. Returning to the data in Table 4.4, we see that only 45 per cent of the applicants have access to such a resource. The fact that this resource is heavily utilized by the limited number having such a file available suggests that this is a valuable resource. The Directors of Educational Research might encourage the institutions with which they are in contact to incorporate such materials in their reference collections. Sample application forms from funding agencies are another source of information frequently used. Even though this type of material is available to less than half the applicants, 75 per cent take the time to review the file.

More generally, the data on resources--both those available and those used--can serve as a guide for the Directors of the RRP as they endeavor to help applicants and institutions develop their research potential. Indeed, it is the availability of a resource at an applicant's institution more than his use of any one resource that is related to funding. This information may be seen in Table 4.6 which shows the proportion of applicants funded: first, according to their access to a particular resource and second, according to their use of it.

For five of the seven resources listed, applicants who have the resource available are more likely to be funded than those who use it. For example, 47 per cent of the applicants who merely have access to ERIC materials are funded, whereas only 38 per cent who use these materials are funded. One more point, 43 per cent who work at an institution having an "information bank" available become successful applicants, but this figure drops to 35 per cent for those who make use of it.

More dramatic perhaps are the data in Table 4.6 for the applicant without even one of the seven listed resources. Just 10 per cent of these applicants are subsequently funded--striking evidence that the applicant working in a barren environment is left behind. In fact, applicants who have resources available, but who choose to ignore them, fare better: 18 per cent are funded.

At first glance, the findings in Table 4.6 seem anomalous. Why should the availability of a resource count more in funding than the applicant's actual use of it? We suggest that whether an applicant uses a particular resource can depend on a number of factors, for example, his previous experience writing proposals, how well-defined his research plan is, or how extensive his research training has been. But the availability of resources at the institution with which he is affiliated is crucial. This measure is an indicator of the research orientation of the institutional setting.

Our data support this reasoning. An applicant's chances of being funded appear to be related to the number of resources available to him.[2] Only 36 per cent of the applicants with a single resource at

---

[2] Appendix B, Table 4.1.

TABLE 4.6

HAVING A RESOURCE AVAILABLE, MORE THAN UTILIZING IT, INCREASES THE CHANCE OF FUNDING

Resource	Available	Used
	(Proportion of applicants funded)	
1. ERIC materials	.47 (205)	.38 (99)
2. An "information bank" of agencies that fund research	.43 (249)	.35 (140)
3. USOE "Guidelines for Small Project Research"	.41 (544)	.41 (516)
4. A "research person" knowledgeable about applying for research funds	.40 (447)	.40 (397)
5. Copies of proposals submitted by others	.40 (281)	.37 (228)
6. USOE "Winning a Research Bid: Tips on Proposal Writing"	.39 (67)	.31 (45)
7. Sample application forms of funding agencies	.35 (272)	.30 (203)
No resources	.10 (31)	.18 (55)
Number of applicants who provided information on available and used resources		652
NA =		13
		665

their disposal are funded, but the percentage increases to 45 per cent for those with five resources at hand. No such pattern, however, exists between funding and utilization of resources (Table 4.7). For example, 47 per cent of the applicants who use two resources are funded, but only 33 per cent of those using four are successful. In fact, not one of the few applicants using all seven resources is funded.

We want to consider one other resource utilized by some applicants that is qualitatively different from those just described, namely, informally discussing one's proposal with a USOE official before submitting it. Typically, these applicants contact the Director of Educational Research in their regions, although a few turn to a

TABLE 4.7

APPLICANTS WHO USE MANY RESOURCES HAVE NO MORE CHANCE OF BEING FUNDED THAN THOSE WHO USE FEW

Number of resources used	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
One	.42	(138)
Two	.47	(150)
Three	.35	(152)
Four	.33	(84)
Five	.46	(46)
Six	.33	(21)
Seven	[0]	(6)
	TOTAL	(597)
	No resources used	55
	NA =	13
		665

Note: Bracketed number refers to the actual number of funded applicants where there are too few cases for determining proportions.

staff member in Washington.[3] Our data indicate that two out of five applicants have this kind of help, and that these applicants are more likely to be funded than the ones who do not consult a USOE official (Table 4.8).

Not unexpectedly, funded applicants find the discussion helpful; applicants not funded think otherwise.[4] Herein lies the difficulty of having an official of USOE discuss an applicant's proposal with him prior to submission. In his desire to be funded, an applicant may interpret suggestions offered by the Director of Educational Research in his region as an informal commitment to funding. If his proposal is subsequently not funded, such an applicant can feel bitter. One said:

---

[3] Appendix B, Table 4.2.

[4] Appendix B, Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.8

APPLICANTS WHO DISCUSS THEIR PROPOSAL WITH A USOE OFFICIAL BEFORE SUBMISSION ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE FUNDED

Discussed proposal with a USOE official?	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
Yes	.43	(268)
No	.32	(392)
TOTAL	.38	(660)
	NA =	5
		665

> I got nothing but encouragement followed by a brush-off [when the proposal was rejected].

Another remarked:

> After improving the format and doing more bibliographic work, the proposal was returned rejected ... This was disheartening to say the least. If they hadn't told us initially that it was a good idea we would have felt less bitter about the ultimate rejection.

The Directors of Educational Research are aware of the tightrope they walk when they talk with an applicant about his proposal before submission. As one Director of Educational Research said:

> You have to be mighty careful in the kind of help that you give. It's easy to get into trouble. They [applicants] can't be led to expect that just because you encouraged them, it will insure their getting funded.

At the same time, several consider helping applicants to be an important part of their work. They are particularly concerned about the less experienced applicant who has no resource person at his institution. The help Directors of Educational Research offer such an applicant includes talking with him about his research ideas, referring him to a consultant nearby, and commenting on an outline or summary of the proposal before it is formally submitted.

An applicant who discusses his proposal with the Director of Educational Research in his region and is then turned down requires special attention when he is informed of the decision. A form letter notifying him that his proposal is not going to be funded is apt to leave him embittered. Although some applicants probably cannot be mollified, it would seem that many could be, if only the Director of Educational Research would take time to contact them on a more personal basis and give them constructive criticism of the proposal.[5] In fact, two not funded applicants volunteered appreciation of just this kind of help.

> I think [a regional intern in this instance] 'caught my purpose' ... At no time did he make me feel inadequate because of lack of experience or recognition in research. He gave me outstanding guidance for improving my research design.
>
> The regional office offered useful suggestions [when my proposal was turned down]. I was more or less disgusted with myself for not having taken more time to do a respectable job.

In offering the suggestion that Directors of Educational Research give special attention to some applicants, we are not overlooking a concomitant problem confronting the Directors every day, namely, the limited--or even complete lack of--clerical and professional help in the regional offices. This matter is being deferred until the next chapter as we wish to conclude this chapter by reviewing briefly the data collected on the time and clerical costs of developing a proposal for small-project research.

Time and Cost

We asked applicants about a few practical matters connected with developing their proposals. To the best of our knowledge no systematic information exists on the number of hours an applicant spends preparing a proposal, whether he does the drafting on his own or on working time, what the clerical costs are, or who underwrites this expense.

---

[5] "Constructive criticism of the proposal" usually has meant that the Director of Educational Research or an assistant selectively excerpts comments made by field readers. Doing so, however, places the Director of Educational Research in the role of judge and can imply that he is an unquestioned expert in every aspect of the research process. An alternative is directly transmitting field reader comments, making the field reader responsible for communicating his evaluation rather than the Director of Educational Research. See Chapter 5 for a discussion of this idea from three perspectives, that of applicants, field readers themselves, and the Directors of Educational Research.

We asked applicants:

> Altogether, about how many hours did you actually spend preparing the proposal?
>
> (Item #23)

Their answers ranged from less than two hours to more than 200. The median time was 48 hours, a week's work.[6]

There is some relationship between the amount of time spent preparing a proposal and its likelihood of being funded. Applicants who spend less than 20 hours on their documents are least likely to be funded (33 per cent); those who spend 41-60 hours are most likely to be funded (41 per cent). However, applicants who labor as long as 100 hours, more than two weeks' work, are less likely to be funded (38 per cent).[7]

Typically applicants prepare proposals on their own time. Only 19 per cent do so on working time.[8] Thus, we know that applicants extend themselves beyond their regular work day to develop the proposals they submit to the RRP and that, by and large, they spend a considerable amount of time on the documents.

We also asked a question about the clerical costs of preparing the proposal:

> It is difficult to calculate a precise figure, but what would you guess the clerical costs of your proposal amounted to?
>
> (Item #22)

The median cost is $48, although applicants spend anywhere from less than $25 to more than $100.[9] As it turns out, however, the cost of preparing the proposal document is not related to the probability of being funded (Table 4.9).

---

[6] Appendix B, Table 4.4.

[7] Appendix B, Table 4.5.

[8] Appendix B, Table 4.6.

[9] Appendix B, Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.9

THE CLERICAL COSTS OF PREPARING THE PROPOSAL ARE NOT RELATED TO FUNDING

Clerical costs of preparing the proposal	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
$100 or more	.38	(121)
$50 - $99	.40	(169)
$25 - $49	.37	(193)
Less than $25	.35	(136)
TOTAL	.38	(619)
	NA =	46
		665

Table 4.10 shows that few applicants personally pay the clerical costs of preparing the proposal.[10] The applicant's department or institution usually absorbs this expense, and this suggests departmental support of the activity.

In addition, Table 4.10 shows that the clerical costs are seldom met by another research project, indirect evidence that few applicants are engaged in an on-going project. However, the few applicants whose clerical costs are absorbed by another project have the highest funding rate (Table 4.11). Conversely, applicants who personally pay all clerical costs have the lowest funding rate. Here again, we have evidence that the applicant on his own has less chance of getting started than the one who can count on the support of his institution.

Summary

This chapter has considered the applicant's experiences while developing his proposal for submission to the RRP. In particular, it has reported how applicants learn of the Program, whether they formulate their research plans before thinking of applying or not until afterwards, the type of resources at hand, and those used in addition

---

[10] The question was worded:

> Who paid the clerical costs of preparing the proposal? (Item #21)

The answer options were: (1) department or institution; (2) another research project; (3) personally; and (4) both institution and personally.

TABLE 4.10

THE APPLICANT'S DEPARTMENT OR INSTITUTION USUALLY PAYS THE CLERICAL COSTS

Who pays the clerical costs?	Proportion of applicants
Department or institution	.74
Applicant	.20
Both institution and applicant	.04
Another research project	.02
	1.00 (661)
NA =	4
	665

TABLE 4.11

THE APPLICANT WHO PERSONALLY PAYS THE CLERICAL COSTS IS LEAST LIKELY TO BE FUNDED

Who pays the clerical costs?	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
Another research project	.50	(16)
Both institution and applicant	.44	(25)
Department or institution	.39	(488)
Applicant	.33	(132)
TOTAL	.38	(661)
	NA =	4
		665

to the time and clerical costs of preparing the document.

The data show that a colleague or superior rather than a USOE official is the applicant's source of information about the Program. It is also apparent that more often than not applicants have well-defined research plans before they think of applying to the RRP, and it is these individuals who are most likely to be funded.

In addition, when they prepare their proposals, most applicants have copies of the USOE "Guidelines" available and access at their institution to a resource person knowledgeable about seeking research funds. Less than half the applicants, however, have the various other resources such as copies of proposals previously submitted by others, sample application forms of funding agencies, or ERIC materials. More important, the likelihood of being funded appears to be related to the type and number of resources available to applicants rather than to which resources or how many were actually utilized. Finally, the probability of being funded is greatest if another project absorbs the clerical costs of preparing the RRP proposal.

CHAPTER FIVE

PROCESSING THE PROPOSAL

Once the researcher has prepared the final draft of his proposal, the next step is to submit the required number of copies to the granting agency. At this point the researcher becomes an applicant, his proposal is assigned an identification number, and processing begins.

In our discussion of the applicant's experience, statistical data will be supplemented by comments from applicants who voluntarily expressed their views. Some were favorably impressed by the way the regional offices processed their proposals; but many, as we shall see, were critical. Whether positive or negative, their statements emphasized first, the length of time from submission to notification of final disposition and second, the explanation given for the granting decision.

Length of Time

One reason for creating regional offices was to streamline the processing of proposals so that the time lapse between submission and notification of the funding decision would be shortened. Unlike many other granting agencies, the USOE Regional Research Program (RRP) has no deadlines for submitting proposals. The Guidelines state:

> Processing of proposals from receipt to notification of action is usually completed within two months, except when complications beyond the control of the Regional Office arise.[1] [Emphasis added.]

The goal of rapid processing is without doubt laudable, but for a variety of reasons, only a limited number of applicants profit from it. In FY '68, the year of this study, two-thirds of them waited longer than they had expected to learn the disposition of their proposals (Table 5.1).

Although a simple check-mark was all that was needed to answer the questionnaire item about the length of time for processing, many applicants wrote letters to present their experiences in greater detail while others jotted notes in the margins of the questionnaires.[2]

---

[1] Guidelines, op. cit., p. 6.

[2] Some applicants did not complete the questionnaire but chose instead to send notes berating us for asking them to fill it out. Each

TABLE 5.1

THE MAJORITY OF APPLICANTS WAIT LONGER THAN EXPECTED FOR THE FUNDING DECISION

Length of time for funding decision	Proportion of applicants
Considerably longer than expected	.40
Somewhat longer	.27
About what expected	.29
Less than expected	.05
TOTAL	1.01 (658)
NA =	7
	665

A few examples will illustrate the difficulty.

> It took approximately 6-8 months to find out that my proposal was not funded. Several calls were made by my advisor to no avail. At one time no one knew the whereabouts of my proposal.
>
> I was told that the grant application would be processed within 3 months. Instead, it took 11 months.
>
> Inquiries were made and I was led to believe that action was imminent. For hand-to-mouth existers, like academicians, this is especially important.
>
> It was 5 months before I was told there would be no money. The constant granting and withdrawing of funds from OE programs makes dealing with them like Russian roulette.

---

expressed the feeling that after taking time to write a proposal and waiting endless weeks to learn that he had been turned down, he had no interest in answering questions about the rejected proposal.

A typical note came from a minister: "This adds injury to insult." We telephoned this applicant, as well as the others who sent similar notes, to suggest that it was better to register their complaints on the questionnaire than to write off USOE. Almost every one of these applicants "took our advice" and returned completed questionnaires.

Regional offices can process proposals within a shorter period of time except when "complications beyond the control of the Regional Office arise," as the Guidelines state. The word "complications" is a euphemism covering problems such as budget freezes and understaffing. Both plagued FY '68 and continue to handicap the Program.

In fact, the Program has yet to have a "typical" year. Budget freezes which negate any attempts to plan even a few months ahead may be imposed at any time during the fiscal year. This "clamping a lid on funds," as one Director of Educational Research phrased it, "can mean no travel, no convening of a panel [to review proposals], even no mailing of proposals for individual reviews."

Good business practice calls for informing the customer, in this instance the applicant, of the budget freeze and the consequent delay in processing his proposal. But a second major problem, namely, minimal clerical and professional staff makes this all but impossible. When the regional offices opened, the Directors of Educational Research were promised staff assistants, but continuous cuts in appropriations have never permitted filling these positions.

Visits to the regional offices and Washington, in addition to interviews with the Directors of the Program, revealed how acute understaffing is for the RRP. The enormity of the problem is perhaps best conveyed in the words of some Directors of Educational Research:

> I've had to beg, borrow and steal clerical help. I've had no one full-time ... When someone is free, I grab them and get them to do some of my correspondence.
>
> I hate to make the old cry of adequate help. My secretarial help is part-time, hit or miss.
>
> It makes me mad to even hear you [interviewer] raise the topic of office help.
>
> A lot of the time I don't have the opportunity to do anything but stack the piles a little higher.

It is only fair to add that three Directors of Educational Research do have adequate clerical help.

> I've got an efficient secretary. She's half-time with me, but she will pick up the phone all day.
>
> We get along fairly well with what we have, and, of course, we're so much better off than they [Directors of Educational Research] are in other regions.
>
> I'm lucky. I've had a half-time girl ever since I started.

Adequate clerical help would relieve the Directors of Educational Research of the routine tasks that they now are forced to neglect. But a clerk would only partially solve the problem. The Directors also need professional assistance, as they readily point out.

> I need someone at the intermediate level ... This would permit me to go into the field to work with the institutions that don't have research potential now.
>
> I surely could use more help--someone with competence who can make decisions. It is hard to be a one-man operation and try to do the job that needs to be done.

It is not news to anyone associated with the RRP that understaffing and budget freezes severely hamper the functioning of the Program. These two administrative problems have been discussed at some length to underscore how adversely they can affect the processing of a proposal and accordingly, the applicant's image of the Program.

Notification of the Granting Decision

In addition to criticizing the RRP for the length of time it takes to process proposals, many applicants included criticisms of the way in which they were informed of the granting decision. Funded applicants confined their remarks to delayed confirmation of funding, but not funded applicants were specific in their negative comments about the treatment they received. Some of their difficulties can be attributed to the minimal staffing and budget freezes just mentioned--in other words, to circumstances beyond the control of the regional offices. Others may be interpreted as suggestions for improving the contact between regional offices and applicants without increasing the workload of the Directors of Educational Research. Again, we have both statistical data and voluntary comments.

Applicants who were not funded were asked whether they requested an explanation of the granting decision and, if so, what they were told. A total of 71 per cent responded "yes" to the question: "Did you ask for an explanation of the [funding] decision"?[3] The applicants then indicated what they had been told. Their answers may be seen in Table 5.2.

The answers most frequently given were that the study was poorly designed or that the proposed research lacked educational significance. These two qualities, along with economic efficiency and adequacy of personnel and facilities, are used for evaluating small-project proposals. It is of interest to note that neither one of the last two criteria is often cited as a reason for not funding a proposal.

---

[3] Appendix B, Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.2

ONE OUT OF FIVE NOT FUNDED APPLICANTS WHO ASKED FOR AN EXPLANATION OF THE FUNDING DECISION FAILED TO RECEIVE ONE

Why proposal was not funded	Proportion of applicants	
Qualities criticized:		
Soundness of design	.39	
Educational significance	.32	
Economic efficiency	.07	
Adequacy of personnel and facilities	.05	
Other (e.g., review of literature)	.04	
Other explanation:		
No explanation provided	.21	
No RRP funds	.13	
Conflicting priority (e.g., within ERIC/CRIER)	.05	
	1.26*	(272)
NA =		21
Cases excluded**		121
		251
		665

*Proportions exceed 1.00 because some applicants gave more than one reason.

**Not funded applicants who did not ask for an explanation (121), and funded applicants (251).

It is not the purpose of this study to evaluate the reasons for not funding an applicant's proposal. We simply report them as part of the data collected, and sometimes these data contain disturbing elements. In particular, we want to consider the finding in Table 5.2 that 21 per cent of the applicants received no explanation of the granting decision, even after asking for one.

The following are examples of the experiences these applicants had when they tried to discover the reasons for their rejection.

> All I got was a curt "this is not the type of thing the small projects can fund" with no indication as to why.
>
> I wrote to see why my proposal was turned down and also wrote a follow-up letter, but I got no reply.
>
> After I received the letter of rejection I wrote to the regional office asking for comments and to this day I have never heard one word from them.
>
> I never was officially informed of action taken. When I finally called long distance ... I was told verbally that the proposal had been rejected. This was the only information I ever received.

Two applicants who were not funded described quite different treatment.

> The reply [to the request for an explanation] was courteous, commented on strong points, and explained the reason for rejection.
>
> [The decision] was adequately explained by telephone and letter. I was pleased with the pleasant personal approach.

These applicants, unfortunately, are the exception. Four out of five not funded applicants who asked for an explanation of the granting decision were not satisfied with the one they received.[4] It can be argued that it is difficult, if not impossible in some cases, to present a convincing argument to the applicant who must be told that his proposal is not going to be funded. Yet the specific comments made by dissatisfied applicants are sufficiently compelling to merit attention.

In essence, each applicant complains about the quality of feedback. After devoting a full week of his time[5] to the preparation of his proposal, he is given the "brush-off" by the regional office. As one applicant remarked:

> I frankly don't see how an investigator can improve any future proposals without obtaining a critique.

---

[4] Appendix B, Table 5.2

[5] Appendix B, Table 4.4.

From our contact with the Directors of the Program, it is difficult to imagine that any would think an applicant is entitled to no more than a perfunctory letter informing him that his proposal is not funded. Pressures of time, lack of staff, and competing priorities probably account for such treatment when it occurs. Yet, repeated phone calls and follow-up letters from querulous applicants also further curtail already scarce office time. Moreover, the dissatisfied group is not a minority; 71 per cent of the not funded applicants had to ask for an explanation[6]--a figure high enough to warrant considering a basic change in RRP management.

An Available Alternative

We suggest that the method of notifying unsuccessful applicants be reviewed by the Directors of the Program in an effort to establish a more uniform policy. Toward this end, we present data collected on a feasible alternative which we hope the Directors of Educational Research will take under advisement. This change involves sending the field reader comments directly to the applicant when he is informed of the funding decision. In order to adequately explore this idea, we sought the viewpoints not just of applicants for RRP funds, but also of field readers, and Directors of Educational Research.

Viewpoints of Applicants and Field Readers

In answer to the question:

> Do you think that a copy of the comments made by field readers should be sent routinely to each applicant?
>
> (Item #26)

almost every applicant said "yes." Moreover, as can be seen in Table 5.3, applicants were equally likely to hold this opinion whether or not their proposals had been funded.

This viewpoint is not restricted to the applicants; the field readers themselves concur (Table 5.4). To be specific, 59 per cent indicate that they favor sending such comments routinely to each applicant. If the 20 per cent who say the comments should be sent only to those who request them is added, a total of 79 per cent endorse this policy. In addition, we call attention to another finding in Table 5.4: field readers make no distinction between funded and not funded applicants as recipients of their comments. Only 1 per cent think that comments should be sent only to applicants whose proposals have been rejected and another 1 per cent hold the opposite view.

---

[6] Appendix B, Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.3

FIVE OUT OF SIX APPLICANTS THINK FIELD READER COMMENTS SHOULD BE SENT TO THEM

Should field reader comments be sent to applicants?	Proportion of applicants funded	Proportion of applicants not funded	
Yes, to every applicant	.85	.87	
Yes, but only to not funded	.06	.08	
Yes, but only to funded	.02	.00	
No, not to any applicant	.04	.01	
Yes, but only if requested	.00	.01	
No opinion	.04	.03	
TOTAL	1.01 (248)	1.00 (413)	
NA =	3	1	
	251	414	(665)

TABLE 5.4

FOUR OUT OF FIVE FIELD READERS THINK THEIR COMMENTS SHOULD BE SENT TO APPLICANTS

Should field reader comments be sent to applicants?	Proportion of field readers
Yes, to every applicant	.59
Yes, but only if requested	.20
No, not to any applicant	.15
Yes, but only to funded	.01
Yes, but only to not funded	.01
No opinion	.04
TOTAL	1.00 (419)
NA =	4
	423

Viewpoints of Directors of Educational Research

We discussed with the Directors of Educational Research the possibility of sending field reader comments to applicants before the results of both the applicant and the field reader surveys were tabulated. Thus, the points of view the Directors express cannot be said to have been influenced by the opinions of either group.

In general, the Directors of Educational Research favor sending field reader comments to applicants, but some have reservations about sending them to every applicant. The reasons for their hesitancy vary, but this is not unexpected. Each Director of Educational Research is an individual in his own right. However, as we shall see, their opinions do not diverge to such an extent that agreement is out of the question.

At present two Directors of Educational Research routinely send field reader comments to applicants. As one said:

> I xerox the field reader comments, cut off the name of the investigator and any personal remarks he may have made. If the proposal has been reviewed by a panel, I send the investigator both the comments made by the panelist prior to coming to the meeting and then the consensus summation.

The other remarked:

> All of these fellows [field readers] know that I'm going to send their comments back to the proposal writer ... There are very few instances when their comments should be tampered with. They might be a little cryptic, but this type of feedback doesn't hurt either.

Other Directors of Educational Research have reservations about routinely sending field reader comments to applicants. They cite four problems:

(1) Some applicants can identify the reviewer(s).
(2) Some field reader comments can be difficult to interpret.
(3) Some evaluations can be unnecessarily harsh.
(4) Reviewers can have discrepant views. This, as one Director of Educational Research put it, "can be particularly bad for the unsophisticated researcher ... and can lower our field readers in their estimate."

We will discuss each of these problems.

One Director of Educational Research anticipates that some applicants would be able to identify the field reader. Another found that this did occasionally occur when he sent out field reader comments a couple of years ago, so he stopped. Three others stated that they have had no repercussions: no applicant has ever reported that he recognized the handwriting or point of view of an evaluator. One of these Directors did add that he has had two requests for the identity of reviewers, but as he said, "the law alone protects me from such a request." And finally, fears should be abated by the knowledge that field readers, the individuals central to the issue, are not at all concerned about this matter: not one mentioned it as a potential threat, not even those voicing an objection to sending their comments to applicants.

Ambiguity and lack of clarity in the comments of field readers can also pose a problem. To avoid this, some Directors of Educational Research analyze the comments, delete those that are beside the point, and summarize the salient ones. But this too can be difficult. First, this is a time-consuming activity for a Director of Educational Research already overburdened with clerical work. Second, as one Director said:

> The ideal time to furnish feedback to applicants is immediately after, say, the panel meets. But this is not possible for proposals that go on the approved list. The longer the time lapse, the more rusty you get in what you remember and often there are points that have to be elucidated a little bit more than the notes you've kept.

Thus, to write a coherent summary of the evaluation, a Director of Educational Research may have to completely review the contents of the applicant's file before composing the letter.

One Director of Educational Research who sends the applicant the verbatim field reader comments has pointed out that the quality of the remarks has improved now that the field reader is aware that they are intended for both the applicant and the USOE.

> Sending out field reader comments has had a miraculous effect on what the field reader says and how he says it. Occasionally a field reader would make some comment on the evaluation form that the analysis proposed 'stinks.' I don't get this anymore. Instead, I get a reasoned explanation of whatever position the evaluator has taken.

This comment leads directly to the third problem anticipated by some Directors of Educational Research, namely: that field reader comments can be too "harshly stated." Although this undoubtedly happens from time to time, the last quotation offers reassurance that field readers are more compassionate if they know their comments are going to be read by the applicant.

It is possible, that upon occasion field readers would prefer to address some of their comments, harsh or not, to USOE exclusively. Such an option could be provided by designing the evaluation form in such a way that a copy of the comments recorded below a perforation could be sent to the applicant and those above would be kept confidential.[7]

To explore the suitability of a perforated evaluation form for the review of proposals, we asked field readers whether they would recommend this change. A total of 36 per cent recommended the format not only for RRP proposals but for all USOE proposals.[8]

We asked the Directors of Educational Research to express their views about this possibility. Three indicated they are "all for it"; two are interested in testing it; one thinks it is preferable, but he would still be confronted with the problem of ambiguity in the comments made by some reviewers; and another thinks it would increase "the burden placed on the reader as well as not mask the style or handwriting of the reviewer." Unfortunately, this question was not raised during the interviews with the two remaining Directors of Educational Research.

The fourth and last problem discussed by some Directors of Educational Research is that of conflicting evaluations which would tend to confuse the applicant. But this problem, too, is manageable. Two Directors have devised ways for coping with it. One said:

> In the beginning I used to iron out the conflict if it existed ... I'd try to be the judge and go-between. But I found that wasn't a good idea ... In fact, I have learned just the opposite. I have letters in my file commenting favorably on the fairness of sending out all the comments.

The other remarked:

> If a guy had four disapprovals and one approval, those sweet comments don't necessarily have to go

---

[7] This type of evaluation form is used by Science, the official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, for reviewing articles. See Bulletin, American Association for the Advancement of Science (March, 1969) and the "Instructions to Reviewers," prepared by the editors of Science.

[8] Chapter Seven, Table 7.2.

> back. Rather than ... falsely encourage the guy I just send him the comments of the others along with the letter that tells him he wasn't funded. After all, he is still hearing from more than one reviewer.

Each of these Directors has a different style, but both provide the applicant with information about the strengths and weaknesses of his proposal. In effect, this feedback is a minimum return on the effort expended by the applicant.

Finally, none of the Directors of Educational Research who have sent verbatim field reader comments to applicants have found that they need to protect the "unsophisticated researcher." As one Director said:

> Sometimes the criticisms are pretty rough, but the applicant can see where he went wrong and strengthen his proposal before he goes to anyone else for money. In the final analysis, is it kinder to turn down an applicant without letting him know why?

Summary

In brief, this chapter has examined the applicant's experience submitting a proposal to the RRP. Some applicants are pleased with the way the regional offices processed their proposals, but many are not. Whether satisfied or not, their evaluations emphasize the length of time from submission to notification of final disposition, and the explanation offered for the granting decision.

Understaffing and budget freezes severely hamper the efficiency with which regional offices can process proposals. These problems plagued FY '68, the year of this study, and continue to handicap the Program.

Some difficulties applicants encounter can be attributed to understaffing and budget freezes, and others to the limited contact they have had with regional offices. In particular, applicants complain about the quality of feedback when they are notified of the granting decision. After spending time preparing the proposal, they are given, as they put it, the "brush-off."

An alternative way to explain the granting decision to applicants is to transmit field reader comments directly to them. Both applicants and field readers favor such a policy. The viewpoints of the Directors of Educational Research diverge somewhat on this topic, but they are willing to consider the possibility. Hopefully, the discussion of the subject in this chapter will begin to answer their questions by providing information not previously available. More generally, we hope that the data presented will be useful to the Program's Directors in determining ways to improve the processing of proposals from submission to final disposition.

CHAPTER SIX

EFFECTS OF THE RESEARCH

In the proposal each applicant states the contribution he anticipates making to education and outlines his plan for dissemination and utilization of the results. This chapter examines the outcomes of the projects funded and some of the ways they have had an impact on education.

These projects are all small-scale efforts and no one expects dramatic short-run effects for the researcher or for the field of education. As one Director of Educational Research remarked:

> I don't expect phenomenal impact out of RRP-supported research. After all, the researchers only have at the longest eighteen months to do their work.

To be sure, research that has "phenomenal impact" is hard to come by whatever the size or duration of the project, and as this Director added: "research that is less than phenomenal can be useful." What the individuals administering the Regional Research Program (RRP) aim for is research that will be implemented, not research that "ends up on the shelf." By implementation they mean dissemination and utilization of research findings:

(1) in the classroom
(2) in colleague exchanges
(3) in work with individual students who then may do further research on education
(4) through professional meetings, publications, and the preparation of in-service teaching materials.

The Directors of Educational Research are also concerned about the impact of the research on the career of the researcher and his institution. One of the purposes of the Program is to strengthen research at developing institutions. Of concern is the researcher who gets funded, gains recognition for the quality of his work and then is recruited by another institution. As a result, the Directors have to start re-building research resources at the institution which has lost the promising researcher.

We have collected considerable data on the outcomes of the research in order to explore its impact on education and on the career of the researcher. At the time we surveyed researchers, nine out of ten had recently written their final reports or were completing the research undertaken with RRP funds.[1] Thus, these data reflect the short-run effects of the research. A follow-up study would be required to uncover long-range effects of the research.

Classroom Teaching

RRP research is utilized in the college classroom. A total of 84 per cent of the funded applicants report that they discuss their projects in class. Over forty per cent present project data as part of their discussion; while another forty per cent keep the discussion on a more general level (Table 6.1).

TABLE 6.1

SIX OUT OF SEVEN RESEARCHERS DISCUSS THEIR PROJECT IN CLASS

Discussion of project in class	Proportion of funded applicants	
Discussed together with data	.43	
Discussed, but no data presented	.41	
Discussed both with and without presenting data	.01	
Not discussed	.15	
TOTAL	1.00	(221)
Cases excluded*		29
NA =		1
		251

*Project just begun.

One might expect that funded applicants who have formal teaching responsibilities would be most likely to discuss their projects in class. However, as Table 6.2 shows, whether funded applicants did or did not have formal teaching responsibilities, they were equally likely to discuss their projects in a class--evidence that RRP researchers are classroom-oriented.

---

[1] Appendix B, Table 6.1.

TABLE 6.2

RESEARCHERS WITH OR WITHOUT TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES
DISCUSS THEIR PROJECTS IN CLASS

Discussion of project in class	Teaching responsibilities			
	Yes		No	
Discussed together with data	.44		.40	
Discussed, but no data presented	.41		.43	
Not discussed	.15		.18	
TOTALS	1.00	(179)	1.01	(40)
			N =	219
			Cases excluded*	29
			NA =	3
				251

*Project just begun.

Even more interesting are the figures in Table 6.3. They show the relationship between the subdivision of a funded applicant and discussion of his project in class.

Although most funded applicants within and outside higher education discuss their research projects in class, those affiliated with a university research bureau are most likely to do so. In fact, every funded applicant at such a bureau engages in class discussion. The old cleavage between teaching and research apparently does not describe RRP-supported research.

Tables 6.1 to 6.3 should be encouraging to policy makers of the RRP who are interested in the dissemination of research to the classroom. If any fear that the results of research facilitated by a university bureau are destined solely for professional journals and books, the data suggest their fears are groundless. Later in this chapter we will explore the publication intentions of funded applicants, but whatever they may be we already know that a major avenue for disseminating the results of research is classroom discussion.

Besides discussion there are other ways whereby research may enter the classroom. As a result of his work, a researcher may encourage students to take specific courses in allied disciplines, he may re-organize a course that he has been teaching, or he may evolve

TABLE 6.3

FUNDED APPLICANTS WITHIN UNIVERSITY RESEARCH BUREAUS INVARIABLY DISCUSS THEIR PROJECTS IN CLASS

Classroom discussion of project	Affiliation: In higher education				Not in higher education
	Research bureau	School of education	Liberal arts	Other subdivision	
Project discussed in class	1.00	.87	.83	.77	.78
Project not discussed in class	.00	.14	.17	.23	.22
TOTALS	1.00 (17)	1.01 (96)	1.00 (64)	1.00 (26)	1.00 (18)

N = 221

Cases excluded* 29

NA = 1

251

---

*Project just begun.

an entirely new course.

Table 6.4 lists five kinds of curriculum changes recommended by researchers, once again taking into account whether they had teaching responsibilities while conducting their projects.

The most likely recommendation of researchers, with or without teaching responsibilities, is shifting emphasis within a particular course. As one would expect, researchers with teaching responsibilities are more likely to re-organize a course (38 per cent) than researchers without such responsibilities (12 per cent).

Of the curriculum modifications listed, researchers are least likely to suggest courses in allied disciplines to students. The data for explaining this finding are not available, but the Directors of Educational Research could suggest this type of cross-fertilization to applicants as another way to utilize the results of research. We know that researchers who change fields, namely, Ph.D.'s in a discipline who switch to education and Ed.D.'s who switch to psychology are likely to be funded (Table 2.8). This suggests that communication among disciplines can be productive for education.

Not all researchers are led to introduce instructional changes, as Table 6.4 also shows. Note that 75 (43 per cent) of the researchers with teaching responsibilities and 20 (54 per cent) of those without teaching responsibilities state that their research has not led them to a single course or curriculum change.

We did some further analysis of these researchers. It turns out that 75 per cent of those who were students at least part-time when they completed the questionnaire recommend curriculum or course modifications, whereas only 45 per cent of the non-student researchers do so (Table 6.5). In sum, RRP research tends to have a greater impact on the curriculum if the project has been conducted by a student--the individual currently striving to adhere to a curriculum plan.

Colleague Exchanges

Collegial exchanges is a second way of implementing RRP research. Typically, this exchange takes place in the seminar setting. To learn whether researchers discuss their research at faculty or student seminars, we asked them:

> Have you been invited to discuss this research with a faculty or student group?
>
> (Item #49)

TABLE 6.4

RRP-SUPPORTED RESEARCH LEADS TO CHANGES IN CURRICULUM

Changes in curriculum	Researcher has teaching responsibilities		
	Yes	No	
Placed more emphasis on certain topics or added new materials	.58	.41	
Reorganized one or more courses	.38	.12	
Planned a new course	.25	.35	
Other changes within researcher's department	.12	.18	
Suggested courses in allied disciplines to students	.10	.06	
TOTALS	1.43* (99)	1.12* (17)	
			N = 116
No changes in curriculum recommended	(75)	(20)	95
		Cases excluded**	29
		NA =	11
			251

---

*Proportions exceed 1.00 because funded applicants could name more than one change.

**Project just begun.

TABLE 6.5

RRP RESEARCH COMPLETED BY STUDENTS IS MOST LIKELY TO RESULT IN CURRICULUM CHANGES

Number of curriculum changes recommended	Status of researcher	
	Student	Non-student
One or more	.75	.45
None	.25	.55
TOTALS	1.00 (57)	1.00 (161)

N = 218
Cases excluded* 29
NA = 4
251

*Project just begun.

The answer options included:

- -- Faculty seminar in my department
- -- Interdepartmental faculty seminar
- -- Faculty-student seminar in my department
- -- Interdepartmental faculty-student seminar
- -- Student society.

The extent of seminar participation by RRP-funded researchers is shown in Table 6.6 below. RRP researchers are more likely to be invited to discuss their research with members of their own department than with members of interdepartmental groups. Recall that Table 6.4 highlights the small number of RRP researchers who suggest courses in allied disciplines to students, and now we see that researchers are not likely to be invited to present their work at interdepartmental seminars.

Individual Student Training

As discussed earlier, a main goal of the RRP is resource building, that is, providing promising researchers with an opportunity to carry out small-scale research projects. Supporting research in institutions without much of a tradition in research is assumed to have a "multiplier effect," as it were. An atmosphere of empirical inquiry will develop in the classroom; students will become more research-minded; and a few will be afforded the chance to become research assistants on projects. The experience of working on projects, it is hoped, will propel some of the abler ones into educational research.

TABLE 6.6

THE RRP-SUPPORTED RESEARCHER IS MOST FREQUENTLY INVITED TO DISCUSS HIS PROJECT WITH A SEMINAR IN HIS OWN DEPARTMENT

Invited to discuss project with:	Teaching responsibilities		
	Yes	No	
Faculty seminar in own department	.50	.33	
Faculty-student seminar in own department	.36	.70	
Interdepartmental faculty seminar	.26	.17	
Interdepartmental faculty-student seminar	.18	.17	
Student society meeting	.14	.03	
TOTALS	1.44* (95)	1.40* (30)	
			N = 125
Not invited to discuss project with any of these groups	(80)	(10)	90
		Cases excluded**	29
		NA =	7
			251

*Proportions exceed 1.00 because researchers could participate in more than one type of seminar.

**Project just begun.

From the reports of RRP-supported researchers we know whether students assisted on their projects and whether these students became more interested in educational research. These results of being funded are examined next.

In two out of three RRP projects, students assist researchers.[2] More important for the future of educational research are the results of Table 6.7. The researcher with teaching responsibilities who advises on doctoral dissertations is most likely to have students assist him in his research. A total of 84 per cent of these researchers state that students work on their projects, whereas only 42 per cent of those who neither teach nor advise on dissertations involve students in their research. In effect, an RRP grant to a dissertation advisor who is teaching is more likely to result in underwriting a student research assistant than a grant to a researcher with neither of these responsibilities.

---

[2] Appendix B, Table 6.2.

TABLE 6.7

TEACHERS WHO ADVISE ON DISSERTATIONS ARE MOST LIKELY TO HAVE STUDENT ASSISTANTS ON RRP PROJECTS

Doctoral dissertation advisor	Teacher	Proportion with student assistants	Number of researchers
Yes	Yes	.84	(62)
Yes	No	[5]	(6)
No	Yes	.68	(113)
No	No	.42	(33)
	TOTAL	.69	214
		Cases excluded*	29
		NA =	8
			251

*Project just begun.

Note: Bracketed number refers to the actual number of funded applicants where there are too few cases for determining proportions.

Still more important, four out of five funded researchers who are both dissertations advisors and teachers report that students who assist them on RRP projects intend to do further work in research, an indication perhaps that experience on a project increases commitment to research (Table 6.8).

Earlier in this chapter we saw that projects conducted by students and by researchers at university bureaus are particularly likely to have an impact at the classroom level (Tables 6.3 and 6.5). Now in Tables 6.7 and 6.8 we see that projects conducted by dissertation advisors provide students with research training which, in turn, stimulates an interest in doing further work in research. In other words, the researcher's stage of professional development, his position, and the nature of his institutional affiliation may influence the

TABLE 6.8

FOUR OUT OF FIVE DISSERTATION ADVISORS WHO ALSO TEACH EXPECT STUDENT ASSISTANTS TO DO MORE RESEARCH

Doctoral dissertation advisor	Teacher	Proportion whose student assistants will do more research	Number of researchers
Yes	Yes	.79	(52)
Yes	No	[0]	(5)
No	Yes	.41	(76)
No	No	.29	(14)
	TOTAL	.52	147
		No student assistants on RRP project	66
		Cases excluded*	29
		NA =	9
			251

*Project just begun.

Note: Bracketed number refers to the actual number of funded applicants where there are too few cases for determining proportions.

dissemination of his research findings. Given the interest of the RRP in supporting research that will contribute to a climate of research on the campus, these data suggest that the Program should continue to support both student and non-student researchers.

Disseminating the results of research beyond the campus is also of interest. Two active means are presenting a paper at a professional meeting and preparing a manuscript for publication. In addition, as a researcher's work becomes known, he may be asked by a professional journal to evaluate an article on a related topic, or approached by a publisher about a book on his research, or invited by a funding agency to evaluate a proposal. The applicants were asked about each of these outcomes and their plans and experiences are discussed here.

Professional Meetings and Publications

Presenting a paper at a professional meeting is an early stage in the dissemination of research findings beyond the campus. A recent study of information exchange in educational research finds that a meeting presentation is typically the first public announcement.[3]

At the time of the survey, 67 per cent of the RRP-supported researchers intended to present or had already presented papers at professional meetings.[4] Most papers are presented at national meetings, although about 15 per cent are presented at state, regional, or international meetings of professional societies.[5]

Students using their projects for doctoral dissertations are less likely to present papers at professional meetings. As Table 6.9 shows, 58 per cent of the doctoral students report their research at professional meetings in contrast to 70 per cent of those who are not using project data for dissertations.

TABLE 6.9

RESEARCHERS NOT WRITING DISSERTATIONS ARE MORE LIKELY TO PRESENT PAPERS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

Present a paper at a professional meeting?	RRP project for dissertation	
	Yes	No
Yes	.58	.70
No	.42	.30
TOTALS	1.00 (59)	1.00 (163)
		N = 222
	Cases excluded*	29
		251

*Project just begun.

---

[3] William D. Garvey, Carnot Nelson and Nan Lin, "A Preliminary Description of Scientific Information Exchange in Educational Research" (Baltimore, Maryland: The Center for Research in Scientific Communication, The Johns Hopkins University, unpublished mimeo, 1968), p. 2.

[4] Appendix B, Table 6.3.

[5] Appendix B, Table 6.4.

One might expect that findings about presentations at meetings would be parallel to that about publications. Though this is true in general, there are differences among RRP-supported researchers. Some attach greater priority to disseminating their research in written form.

First, a higher proportion of researchers write for publication. As noted above, 67 per cent present a paper based on this RRP research at a professional meeting whereas 72 per cent are writing or have written their research results for publication.[6] As a rule, researchers write journal articles, although about ten per cent plan to write a book or part of a book.[7]

Second, not all researchers are equally likely to publish. The researcher with a Ph.D. in a discipline is most likely to prepare a manuscript for publication; the Ed.D. is least likely (Table 6.10).

TABLE 6.10

THE PH.D. IN A DISCIPLINE IS MOST LIKELY TO PUBLISH THE RESULTS OF HIS RRP-SUPPORTED RESEARCH

Plan to publish the results of this research?	Type of doctorate: Ph.D. in a discipline	Ph.D. in education	Ed.D.
Yes	.75	.70	.68
No	.25	.30	.32
TOTALS	1.00 (65)	1.00 (27)	1.00 (38)
		N =	130
		Cases excluded*	121
			251

*RRP-supported researchers who did not have a doctorate when they applied for funds (N = 109), and researchers with a doctorate whose project had just begun (N = 12).

The Ph.D. in a discipline is expected to be more research-minded while the Ed.D., more practice-minded. And the publication plans of the

---

[6] Appendix B, Table 6.5.

[7] Appendix B, Table 6.6.

Ph.D. in a discipline and the Ed.D. recipients of RRP funds appear to suggest these different objectives. Whereas 75 per cent of the Ph.D.'s in a discipline intend to publish the results of their RRP research, this figure is 68 per cent for the Ed.D.'s.

Moreover, the publication history of RRP recipients with doctorates parallels the pattern of the publication intentions just outlined. As may be seen in Table 6.11, 92 per cent of the applicants with Ph.D.'s in a discipline have published at least one research study before applying for a RRP small-projects grant, then comes applicants with Ph.D.'s in education, and only then the Ed.D.'s.

TABLE 6.11

ALMOST EVERY PH.D. IN A DISCIPLINE HAS PUBLISHED A RESEARCH STUDY BEFORE APPLYING FOR RRP FUNDS

Number of research studies published prior to applying for RRP funds	Type of doctorate		
	Ph.D. in a discipline	Ph.D. in education	Ed.D.
One or more	.92	.85	.79
None	.08	.15	.21
TOTALS	1.00 (159)	1.00 (81)	1.00 (106)
			N = 346
			Cases excluded* 309
			NA = 10
			665

*RRP applicants who do not have a doctorate.

Although students who intend their RRP projects for doctoral dissertations are less likely than non-students to present papers at professional meetings (Table 6.9), this does not mean that they do not publish the results of their research. As Table 6.12 shows, 75 per cent of the students have publication plans for their research, a figure which surpasses 71 per cent for the non-student group.

Finally, the publication plans of doctoral students who subsequently received their degrees[8] are worth noting, even though they

---

[8] Thirty-seven of the 65 doctoral students (57 per cent) reported that they received the doctorate after completing the RRP project.

TABLE 6.12

THREE OUT OF FOUR DOCTORAL STUDENTS WHO INTEND THEIR RRP PROJECT FOR A DISSERTATION ALSO PLAN TO PUBLISH THE RESULTS OF THEIR RESEARCH

Plan to publish the results of this research?	RRP project for a dissertation Yes	 No
Yes	.75	.71
No	.25	.29
	1.00 (59)	1.00 (163)
		N = 222
		Cases excluded* 29
		251

*Project just begun.

represent only 57 per cent of the funded doctoral students. For this group of researchers, a total of 85 per cent who earned an Ed.D. plan to publish the results of their RRP research (Table 6.13). Even the young Ph.D. in education will be more active in publishing than those holding Ph.D.'s in education granted before 1968 (79 per cent, Table 6.13 to 70 per cent, Table 6.10, respectively). These data suggest that the younger generation of doctorates have a greater interest than the older generation in disseminating the results of their research through publication.

Invitations and Requests

To learn the extent to which the dissemination of research conducted by RRP researchers leads to various invitations and requests, we asked the following question:

> As a result of this research, have you received any of the following requests or invitations?
> (Item #53)

These options were listed:

-- Asked by a colleague to critically read a paper.
-- Asked by a journal to evaluate an article on a related topic.
-- Asked by a journal to review a book on a related topic.

TABLE 6.13

RRP-SUPPORTED DOCTORAL STUDENTS WHO EARN AN ED.D. ARE MOST LIKELY TO PLAN TO PUBLISH THE RESULTS OF THEIR RESEARCH

Plan to publish the results of this research?	Type of doctorate earned Ed.D.	 Ph.D. in education	 Ph.D. in a discipline
Yes	.85	.79	[3]
No	.15	.21	[2]
TOTALS	1.00 (13)	1.00 (19)	[5]

N = 37
Cases excluded* 214
251

*Non-students (186) and students (28) who did not report they had received their doctorate when they completed the questionnaire.

Note: Bracketed numbers refer to the actual number of funded applicants where there are too few cases for determining percentages.

-- Approached by a publisher about writing a book on this subject.
-- Asked by a funding agency to evaluate a proposal in this or a related area of research.
-- Invited by a funding agency to submit a proposal for further research in the area.

Table 6.14 shows the proportion of funded applicants receiving each of these invitations and requests.

Two out of five researchers, as a result of their RRP project, are "asked by a colleague to critically read a paper." This is the principal request. Very few researchers receive any of the other requests. For example, only 11 per cent are "asked by a journal to evaluate an article on a related topic," and fewer still--6 per cent --are asked by a journal to do a book review on a related topic. Invitations such as these are probably forthcoming after a researcher's work becomes known and accordingly, a follow-up study would be required to uncover these effects.

TABLE 6.14

FEW RRP RESEARCHERS ARE ASKED TO TAKE ON ASSIGNMENTS RELATED TO THEIR RESEARCH

Requests or invitations	Proportion of funded applicants	Number of funded applicants
1. Asked by a colleague to critically read a paper	.38	(206) NA = 16 222*
2. Approached by a publisher about writing a book on a related topic	.15	(206) NA = 16 222*
3. Asked by a journal to evaluate an article on a related topic	.11	(205) NA = 17 222*
4. Invited by a funding agency to submit a proposal for further research	.07	(205) NA = 17 222*
5. Asked by a funding agency to evaluate a proposal in this or a related area	.06	(205) NA = 17 222*
6. Asked by a journal to review a book on a related topic	.06	(207) NA = 15 222*

*Twenty-nine cases excluded because project just begun.

Career of the Researcher

We conclude this chapter on the short-range effects of RRP research by discussing first, the funded applicant's interest in doing further research on education and second, his professional mobility. As we shall see, being a recipient of RRP funds has considerable effect on interest in doing further research on education and little effect on mobility.

We asked applicants:

> What effect has this research experience had on your interest in doing research on education?
> (Item #57)

We then presented the following answer options:

- -- It has strengthened my interest in doing research on education.
- -- It has not appreciably affected my interest.
- -- It has diminished my interest in doing research on education.

Seven out of ten funded applicants report that their interest in doing research on education has been strengthened as a result of their RRP project. Only three per cent indicate their RRP experience diminished their interest in research on education.[9]

As Table 6.15 shows, the funded applicants who are most likely to state that their interest in research on education has been strengthened, are the students who undertake projects for their doctoral dissertations. A total of 81 per cent indicate that their interest in the field has increased. This finding does not detract from the 68 per cent of the non-students experiencing greater interest. Resource building, that is recruiting researchers to the field of education is the focal point of the RRP, and every Director of Educational Research seeks to find such people. Without a doubt, their work has been productive, as Table 6.15 shows.

As a group, funded applicants do not change institutional affiliations. Three out of four have remained at the same institution.[10]

Of the funded applicants, only those who intend their projects for dissertations are more likely to have moved. As may be seen in Table 6.16, 57 per cent re-located, in contrast to 14 per cent of the remaining funded applicants.

---

[9] Appendix B, Table 6.7.

[10] Appendix B, Table 6.8.

TABLE 6.15

FOUR OUT OF FIVE DOCTORAL STUDENTS REPORT THAT THEIR INTEREST IN RESEARCH ON EDUCATION HAS BEEN STRENGTHENED AS A RESULT OF THEIR PROJECTS

Effect of funding on research interest	RRP project for a dissertation	
	Yes	No
Strengthened interest in doing research on education	.81	.68
No appreciable effect	.14	.30
Diminished interest	.05	.02
TOTALS	1.00 (64)	1.00 (184)

N = 248
NA = 3
251

TABLE 6.16

ONLY RRP-SUPPORTED DOCTORAL STUDENTS CHANGE INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION AFTER STARTING THEIR RESEARCH

Institutional affiliation	RRP project for a dissertation	
	Yes	No
Different	.57	.14
Same	.43	.86
TOTALS	1.00 (56)	1.00 (176)

N = 232
NA or not employed = 19
251

The fact that more than one half of the doctoral students relocate is not particularly surprising. From the perspective of the RRP the important point is that they develop a keen interest in research on education, which they carry to their new location.

Summary

This chapter has examined the results of RRP-supported research as they affect classroom teaching, colleague exchanges, training of individual students, publication plans, and the career of researchers. The data show that almost every researcher discusses his project in the classroom, about half participate in departmental seminars, and dissertation advisors who also have teaching responsibilities offer students the opportunity to work on their projects. In addition, most researchers plan to publish a manuscript based on their RRP research.

The students who are funded and intend using their RRP projects for dissertations are particularly interesting. As a result of their RRP research, they are more likely than non-students to recommend course or curriculum changes, to plan publishing the results of the research, and to have developed a strong interest in research on education.

CHAPTER SEVEN

APPRAISAL OF THE PROGRAM

This chapter provides an appraisal of the USOE Regional Research Program (RRP) by all respondents. It covers the process of review, the ceiling on grants, and the image of the Program.

The Review Process

Chapter 5 examined the review process from the perspective of applicant for small project grants. Now we want to consider the review process from the perspective of two other key participants, the field readers and the Directors of the Program. In particular, we will discuss their viewpoints of the two systems for reviewing proposals (by panel or by correspondence), and of the USOE Field Reader Evaluation Form. We will also report what field readers see as the advantages of being a reviewer and their comments about the Program.

As may be recalled, we surveyed field readers who had reviewed at least one proposal for the RRP in FY '68. In this discussion of the field reader data, however, we are not only interested in their experiences in FY '68, but in their cumulative experiences. And, most field readers who served in FY '68 have continued with the Program, 82 per cent to be precise.[1]

All but two of the field readers surveyed have reviewed RRP proposals by correspondence[2] and 27 per cent have also reviewed them at a panel session.[3] We asked field readers to evaluate these two systems for reviewing proposals by answering the following question:

> On balance, which system of review do you think yields better evaluations of Regional Research Program proposals: (a) proposals reviewed at a panel session? (b) those reviewed by correspondence?
> (Item #19)

A total of 33 per cent said they prefer the panel system, 7 per cent review by correspondence, and 60 per cent said they could not compare the two.[4]

---

[1] Appendix B, Table 7.1.

[2] Appendix B, Table 7.2.

[3] Appendix B, Table 7.3.

[4] Appendix B, Table 7.4.

Cross-tabulating the field reader's experience with his appraisal of the two systems of review produced the results presented in Table 7.1.

TABLE 7.1

THREE OUT OF FOUR FIELD READERS WHO HAVE REVIEWED RRP PROPOSALS AT A PANEL SESSION PREFER THE PANEL SYSTEM

	Experience		
Preferred system for reviewing proposals	Reviewed proposals by correspondence and by panel	Reviewed proposals by correspondence only	
At a panel session	.76	.17	
By correspondence only	.09	.06	
Cannot compare the two systems	.15	.77	
TOTALS	1.00 (111)	1.00 (286)	
		N =	397
		NA =	26
			423

As may be seen in the table, 76 per cent of the field readers who have participated in panel sessions prefer this system of review. By and large, field readers who have been only individual reviewers report they cannot compare the two systems.

Some field readers jotted notes in the margins of their questionnaires explaining their preferences. A few examples are cited.

> I feel strongly that the panel process gives the proposal writer a better evaluation of his document than a review just by mail.
>
> The panel affords an opportunity to thrash out differences in reviewer evaluations.
>
> I have found the panels stimulating and without a doubt, the best in-service education I experience.

Not every field reader favors the panel. Two who prefer to review by mail said:

> Reviewing by mail, one must get down to business. I have found that some panel members don't "do their homework," and the others have to do all the work.
>
> I can spend more time reviewing a single proposal by mail than reviewing a batch of proposals for a panel session.

Of the nine Directors of Educational Research, eight were asked their opinions of the two review systems. All of the eight Directors rated the panel as the better method. Their reasons are perhaps best stated in their own words. One Director said:

> First and foremost, the panel provides an opportunity for the opinions of several individuals to converge on a particular topic. One of these may point up something all the others have not seen. And, it's an interdisciplinary effort and profits from the give-and-take that goes on in the course of arriving at a decision.

Another added:

> The panel is the best way to keep subjectivity to a minimum. Some of these reviewers really get emotionally involved and the others bring him back in line.

A third summed up his preference by saying:

> The panel is the superior system. The proposals get reviewed three times: (1) by the readers at home; (2) here as they are discussed; and (3) as they think them over in reaching consensus.

In addition, two Directors of Educational Research think it is a good idea for observers to attend panel sessions. They reason that the panel then becomes an additional resource-building tool in their regions. One described his recent experience in these words:

> I got in touch with the directors of regional training programs in my region and invited each of them to send one of their research trainees at their own expense to a panel meeting. The directors agreed enthusiastically. I then sent a copy of every proposal that was to be considered at the panel to the research trainees, and asked them to read the proposals before coming to the session. I also told them they could comment on the

> proposals at the panel session, but they were not to dominate the discussion.
>
> I then insisted on their [invited guests] taking one responsibility: they were to report their experiences at the panel, without identifying any individual when they got back to their college. I must say I got very good reports on this.

Field Reader Evaluation Form

Both field readers and the Directors of Educational Research commented on the suitability of the Field Reader Evaluation Form for reviewing proposals submitted to the RRP. As we shall see, some recommend changes. Table 7.2 lists six changes in the form that field readers considered, and shows the proportion who recommend each one. We will discuss each change, adding the viewpoints of the Directors of Educational Research wherever available. Since the questionnaire to field readers was developed after interviewing the Directors of Educational Research, we do not have their opinions on every change considered by field readers.

Six Proposed Changes

(1) A total of 69 per cent of the field readers recommend that the criterion "adequacy of personnel and facilities" be separated into two parts: "adequacy of personnel" and "adequacy of facilities." They reason that these are in fact two distinct qualities which they would prefer not to evaluate jointly. For example, they may question the researcher's ability to carry out the project, but not the organizational facilities available to him. They would like the form to provide separate sections for such a contingency.

(2) The second change most field readers would like to have initiated is a rating scale for each criterion. After evaluating, say, the educational significance of a proposal, the field reader would then rate this criterion on a scale graded from 0 to 10. He would follow a similar procedure for the other criteria. One Director of Educational Research favors quantifying evaluations of a proposal in this way. The other Directors expressed no preference.

(3) The recommendation:

> Perforate the form so that [field reader] comments recorded below a perforation could be sent to the applicant, while those above would be for USOE exclusively

was considered in Chapter 5 as one way the field reader comments could be transmitted directly to the applicant. As may be recalled,

TABLE 7.2

CHANGES IN THE USOE EVALUATION FORM RECOMMENDED BY FIELD READERS

Suggested changes	Proportion of field readers recommending change	
Separate the criterion "adequacy of personnel and facilities" into two criteria, "adequacy of personnel" and "adequacy of facilities"	.69	
Provide a rating scale for each of the four criteria	.62	
Perforate the form so that comments recorded below a perforation could be sent to the applicant, while those above would be for USOE exclusively	.36	
Eliminate page 2 which asks the reviewer to discuss the proposal as it relates to his area of specialization	.33	
Standardize the form by using check-lists instead of essay-type answers	.29	
Eliminate the criterion:		
(1) economic efficiency	.13	
(2) adequacy of personnel and facilities	.03	
(3) educational significance	.03	
(4) soundness of research design	.01	
TOTAL	2.49*	(334)
No changes recommended		89
		423

*Proportion exceeds 1.00 because each field reader could recommend more than one change in the evaluation form.

applicants, field readers, and several Directors of Educational Research favor sending a copy of the field reader comments to the applicant.

(4) One-third of the field readers think that page 2 of the evaluation form, which asks the reviewer to discuss the proposal as it relates to his area of specialization, should be eliminated.[5] Three Directors of Educational Research also are of this opinion. As one said:

> I'd cut out that second page. We already know the field reader is qualified before we send him any proposals to read.

(5) Whether to standardize the form by using check-lists instead of essay-type answers evoked the most comment from the Directors of Educational Research. Two completely opposed the idea. The first explained his opposition in these words:

> I wouldn't want a check-list ..., concepts like "educational significance" defy a pat definition ... We shouldn't furnish them [field readers] with the language necessary to make the evaluation.

The second remarked:

> The field reader picks out what he considers the most salient aspects [of the proposal] deserving comment. This is one way to evaluate his [field reader's] performance. You'd miss this opportunity with any kind of check-list, and there may be a tendency to just check without adequate thought.

Four Directors are interested in exploring the feasibility of developing some form of check-list, but not one of these favors only check-lists. Each wants space for essay-type responses, as do eighteen field readers who jotted comments in the margins of their questionnaires next to the item.

The criterion, soundness of research design, would be in the view of one Director, the best criterion for check-lists. For example, a check-list might specify the group to be studied, the sample size, the research methods, and the planned modes of analysis. The field reader would rate the extent to which these items were spelled out in the proposed research.

---

[5] We recently learned from one Director of Educational Research that field readers are no longer asked to complete this page.

(6) By and large, field readers would retain the four criteria now used to evaluate proposals. The only criterion some question is economic efficiency: 13 per cent would eliminate it. This is also the only criterion questioned by the Directors of Educational Research. Two think it does not belong on the form. In their view, it is not within the province of field readers, but of the project officer, who reviews the budget after a proposal is approved for funding. They point out that the local contribution, or cost sharing, is negotiated later, if the proposal is approved for funding.

Two others look at the criterion economic efficiency from another perspective. One said:

> Economic efficiency is an important factor ... [field] readers can generally tell whether an applicant is trying to do too much for too little or not enough for too much.

The other expressed essentially the same opinion but added that the "good" field reader suggests budget alternatives when he disagrees with what the applicant proposes. If computer time in a proposal is underestimated, for example, he should offer a more realistic estimate. In other words, these Directors of Educational Research want the field reader to review the specific budget entries.

Finally, some field readers[6] recommend adding other criteria to the four now used to evaluate proposals. In particular, they would approve including the following criteria:

-- significance beyond education
-- creativity of the researcher
-- suitability [of the proposed research] for replication.

These criteria seem suggestive enough to warrant further thinking. To be applicable, however, they would have to be defined and this is a difficult task. For example, the criterion "significance beyond education" is defined by one respondent as "overall theoretical and scientific significance." To another, it means "immediate societal usefulness." Obviously, both respondents have different ideas about the definition of this criterion and neither definition satisfactorily explains it. Moreover, adding a criterion as sweeping as "significance beyond education" seems to place unrealistic expectations on a small-scale project to be completed within a maximum of eighteen months. We did, however, want to mention this suggested criterion along with the other two for the Directors of the Program to take into account should they revise the Field Reader Evaluation Form.

---

[6] Appendix B, Table 7.5.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Being a RRP Field Reader

Field readers assessed their experience with the RRP in two ways. First, they checked a list of advantages which might be associated with being a field reader; and second, they gave their reactions to the overall Program.

To learn something of the motivation of field readers, we included the following item in the questionnaire:

> Listed below are some possible advantages of being a field reader for the Regional Research Program. Indicate those that apply to you personally.
> (Item #39)

The eight answer options were:

- -- Acquisition of 'intelligence' about USOE granting practices
- -- Contact with educational researchers from other institutions
- -- Contact with USOE officials
- -- Exposure to new research ideas
- -- Intellectual stimulation
- -- Opportunity to contribute ideas to young researchers
- -- Opportunity to influence research on education
- -- Professional prestige.

The responses are summarized in Table 7.3 below.

As may be seen in the table, field readers value most the intellectual experience of reviewing proposals. A total of 79 per cent checked "exposure to new research ideas"; next, 68 per cent checked "intellectual stimulation." In contrast, only 23 per cent see "professional prestige" as a reward from being a field reader.

At the very end of the questionnaire space was provided for field readers to comment on any aspect of the Program they wished. Thirty per cent of the field readers expressed their views, and the comments are summarized in Table 7.4.

Four out of ten field readers who volunteered comments about the RRP consider it to be basically sound. Many field readers are enthusiastic about the Program, and the following excerpts from their remarks illustrate this point of view.

> I have a strong positive bias toward the RRP. It is closer to its clients than the central agency and the

TABLE 7.3

FIELD READERS VALUE MOST THE EXPOSURE TO NEW RESEARCH IDEAS THAT RESULTS FROM REVIEWING RRP PROPOSALS

Advantages of being a field reader	Proportion of field readers who say advantage applies to them	
1. Exposure to new research ideas	.79	
2. Intellectual stimulation	.68	
3. Opportunity to influence research on education	.61	
4. Acquisition of 'intelligence' about USOE granting policies	.46	
5. Opportunity to contribute ideas to young researchers	.42	
6. Contact with educational researchers from other institutions	.42	
7. Contact with USOE officials	.35	
8. Professional prestige	.23	
9. Other (e.g., opportunity to perform a public service)	.06	
TOTAL	4.02*	
	N =	393
Perceives no professional advantage		7
	NA =	23
		423

*Proportion exceeds 1.00 because field readers could name more than one advantage.

> people that I know feel it is much more open and accessible.
>
> The RRP is effective ... It encourages some reasonably good and a few excellent research projects. All in all, a good batting average.
>
> I strongly support the RRP. In comparison with research programs in or out of education, large or

TABLE 7.4

FOUR OUT OF TEN FIELD READERS COMMENTING ON THE RRP SEE IT AS A SOUND PROGRAM

Volunteered comments about the RRP	Proportion of field readers who made each comment	
Positive comment:		
Program is basically sound	.39	
Negative comments:		
Remuneration is inadequate for field readers	.21	
Program is poorly administered	.10	
Recommendations:		
Contact between field readers and regional office should be improved	.20	
Practical implications of research should be emphasized more	.15	
Funds for the Program should be increased	.13	
Promising young researchers should get more support	.10	
	1.28*	
	N =	128
Too little knowledge of Program to comment		24
	NA =	271
		423

*Proportion exceeds 1.00 because some field readers commented on more than one aspect of the Program.

> small, it is good. Some fine work has been done in projects that cost a pittance.
>
> The small grant program in my estimation has been most successful in stimulating a wide range of research in a variety of settings. I would count it

> the most productive and the highest cost/benefit ratio of all USOE programs.

Apart from general reaction to the Program, Table 7.4 also shows that one in five field readers criticize the remuneration they receive. In particular, they criticize the low remuneration and the excessive length of time it takes to receive it. With respect to the modest amount received for evaluating proposals, one field reader said:

> The remuneration is so low that it hardly warrants the expense of processing, plus it demeans the value of the service in the eyes of those performing it. The fee should be raised or eliminated and, if the latter, some other means of recognition for the service should be considered.

Another remarked:

> I think field readers should be paid more. It is difficult and time consuming work. I enjoy it but my time needs to be compensated or other ventures encroach.

In addition, some field readers complain about the long interval between review of a proposal and payment. As one phrased it:

> Remuneration is scandalously slow. I have not been paid for proposals I evaluated seven or eight months ago.

Twenty-four field readers said they had so little knowledge of the Program that they could not comment on it. Others offered recommendations for improving the Program; the major one being better communication between field readers and the Program. The need is conveyed by these statements from field readers who feel out of touch with the Program:[7]

> One of the RRP's limitations is that field readers have never really been oriented.

Another remarked:

> The evaluation of a proposal meets a dead end of silence. It is somewhat frustrating to review a proposal and then have no clue as to the consequence of my comments, helpful or otherwise. For that matter, I am not even told whether the proposal gets funded.

---

[7] With the increasing use of panels, such a sense of isolation is likely to be reduced.

Improved communication can take several forms. For some of the field readers, it is feedback. One expressed it this way:

> There should be more feedback to reviewers. I mean about what happens to the proposals I evaluate ... At present I work in isolation, reacting to proposals on an absolute basis with virtually no knowledge of the Program's goals.

The theme of Program goals and fate of proposals was voiced over and over again. Another idea comes from a field reader who suggests that it would be helpful to arrange for field readers to meet as a group with the Directors of the Program at the AERA (American Educational Research Association) annual convention. Field readers would then have an opportunity to ask questions about the Program and to keep abreast of its development.

Finally, 13 per cent of the field readers urge that the RRP be better financed and even expanded. A few of their comments are excerpted here.

> The RRP should be more soundly financed. It puts the DER's [Directors of Educational Research] in a damned embarrassing position when they must drum up proposals and have good proposals rejected because of inadequate funds.
>
> Uncertainty over the availability of funds has served to delay the review of proposals.
>
> I hope the USOE will put more of its resources in the RRP. It should be expanded.

The Present Ceiling

At present, the ceiling for funding an RRP project is $10,000. Because of rising costs and overhead, some Directors of Educational Research question the adequacy of the present ceiling. Therefore, we asked applicants, field readers, and Directors what the ceiling should be.

Table 7.5 below shows what applicants and field readers recommend as the ceiling for small-project research. A large proportion would retain the $10,000 ceiling (44 per cent of the not funded; 30 per cent of the funded; and 40 per cent of the field readers). A small proportion would lower it (7 per cent of the not funded; 1 per cent of the funded; and 2 per cent of the field readers). But as the figures in Table 7.5 show, a considerable proportion of applicants and field readers recommend a higher ceiling.

Opinions among the three groups differ. The not funded applicants are the most conservative and less likely than funded applicants to

TABLE 7.5

A CONSIDERABLE PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS AND FIELD READERS THINK THE $10,000 CEILING FOR SMALL-PROJECT RESEARCH SHOULD BE RAISED

Recommended ceiling	Cumulative proportion		
	Applicants		
	Not funded	Funded	Field readers
$2,000	.01	.00	.00
3,000	.02	.00	.00
5,000	.06	.01	.01
7,000	.07	.01	.01
7,500	.07	.02	.01
8,000	.07	.02	.02
10,000	.51	.31	.42
12,000	.53	.39	.44
12,500	.55	.40	.45
13,500	.55	.41	.45
15,000	.72	.71	.60
17,500	.74	.75	.60
20,000	.89	.91	.78
22,500	.89	.92	.78
25,000	.98	.97	.96
30,000	.99	.97	.97
50,000	1.00	1.00	1.00
TOTALS	(344)	(234)	(347)
No ceiling recommended	1	1	7
NA =	69	16	69
	414	251	423
MEDIANS	$10,000	$14,000	$14,000

recommend a higher ceiling. Forty-nine per cent of the not funded would raise the ceiling; 69 per cent of the funded recommend raising it; and 58 per cent of the field readers would raise it. The funded applicants are confronted with the reality of their budgets: more than 50 per cent think that the ceiling should be $15,000 or higher and 25 per cent think it should be $20,000 or higher.

Essentially three reasons are given for higher ceilings:

(1) It would cover inflationary increases in project costs;

(2) It would permit greater flexibility in research design;

(3) It would provide higher salaries for research and clerical staff and permit acquisition of necessary equipment.

Those who regard the present ceiling as adequate also told us why they hold this opinion. A few of their comments follow:

> $10,000 is enough to 'get off the ground.'
>
> The amount [$10,000] is about right to promote quickly realized objectives.
>
> Keeping the ceiling low tends to discourage 'grantsmanship.'

A few funded applicants noted that the $10,000 ceiling would be adequate were it not for the big overhead bite. Two described their experience in this way. The first remarked:

> The $10,000 limit is reasonable, if I could use it all for research, but the overhead requirements of my institution reduce the figure too much.

And the second:

> $10,000 turned out to be too small to fit everything in after the university got its 20 per cent overhead.

The Directors of Educational Research also commented on the present ceiling. One favors the present ceiling, summarizing his viewpoint in these words:

> The ceiling doesn't seem to interfere with the product. Some fine research has been done for less than

> $10,000. I don't know that I could buy any higher quality research with more money.

Another thinks the present ceiling is appropriate, but is bothered by the indirect costs. In essence, he thinks the base for funds should be $10,000 plus indirect costs.

The remaining Directors who discussed the present ceiling favor raising it, but not giving the maximum to every funded applicant. To be specific, they favor a lower ceiling for the doctoral candidate. The amount they suggest ranges from a low of $4,000 to a limit of $10,000. Although the Directors differ on the exact ceiling for supporting a doctoral candidate, their reasoning is essentially the same. They want the funds to cover needed facilities, possibly a modest remuneration for the sponsor, and a stipend between $3,000 and $5,000 for the doctoral candidate himself.

These Directors of Educational Research want the ceiling raised for other applicants. One said:

> I think an established researcher (one who has a reputation for good work) ought not to be limited to $10,000. Depending on the project he proposes, he ought to be eligible for $30,000, $40,000, maybe even $50,000.

Another summarized his point of view in these words:

> I'd like to see the ceiling raised along with the unsolicited nature of the program preserved. $50,000 or under is my preference and the exact amount should be worked out in the regional office with the applicant.

And, finally, one Director thinks no ceiling should be imposed.

> The ceiling is completely uncalled for. We should handle all unsolicited proposals, for $1,000 or $100,000.

Overall Image of the RRP

Applicants, field readers, and the nine Directors of Educational Research gave us their impressions of the RRP by answering four questions about the Program's interests or procedures. These questions will be discussed separately so that the Directors can learn the opinions of those having contact with the Program.

The first question read:

> Through a variety of sources, researchers get an overall impression of funding agencies. Is it your current impression that the Regional Research Program is limited to a few areas of special interest, or does it cover a broad range of interests in education?

Three answer options were provided:

> -- A few areas of special interest
> -- A broad range of interests
> -- I have no impression

Table 7.6 below shows the proportion of applicants, field readers, and Directors who checked each of the answer-options.

TABLE 7.6

TWO OUT OF FIVE APPLICANTS AND FIELD READERS LACK A CLEAR IMAGE OF THE RESEARCH INTERESTS OF THE RRP

Image of RRP research interests	Proportion			
	Funded applicants	Not funded applicants	Field readers	Directors of Educational Research
Broad range of interests	.57	.18	.43	[9]*
Few areas of special interest	.09	.38	.17	[0]
No impression	.34	.44	.40	[0]
TOTALS	1.00 (248)	1.00 (409)	1.00 (413)	9
NA =	3	5	10	0
	251	414	423	9

*The number of DER's who gave each response appears in brackets.

Every Director stated that the RRP has a "broad range of interests," but only 57 per cent of the funded applicants, 43 per cent of the field readers, and 18 per cent of the not funded applicants share this impression. The fact that only 18 per cent of the not funded applicants see the Program as having a "broad range of interests" is probably an unintended consequence of having their proposals turned down. This study points up one aspect of research support which rarely is discussed: an agency's image depends not only on how many researchers it funds, but also on how many it turns down.

The most interesting aspect of Table 7.6 is the large number of both applicants and field readers who have no impression about the research interests of the RRP. One out of three funded applicants have no impression and two out of five field readers also have no impression. These figures suggest that many participants in the Program have virtually no knowledge of the Program's research interests.

The second question asked about the image of the RRP was:

> Do you think the USOE Regional Research Program tends to be orthodox or venturesome in its support of research?

The answer options were:

> -- Orthodox; more likely to support established lines of research.
>
> -- Venturesome; willing to take risks in developing new lines of research on education.
>
> -- No opinion.

Table 7.7 shows how the three groups of respondents answer this question. Eight out of nine Directors characterize the Program as venturesome. The one Director who checked "orthodox," added:

> I would like to support more venturesome research, but I find that field readers are more likely to approve 'orthodox' research plans.

Moreover, one-third of the applicants, whether funded or not, and 39 per cent of the field readers have no opinion regarding the tendency of the RRP to be orthodox or venturesome in its support of research. Here again, there is a sharp contrast between the funded and not funded applicants. Only 5 per cent of those not funded view the Program as venturesome, but the number reaches 41 per cent for the funded applicants. It would seem that being denied support has repercussions other than loss of funds.

Even fewer applicants and field readers know whether the RRP is strict or lenient in permitting departures from the original proposal. This question was asked:

> As far as departures from the original proposal are concerned, is it your opinion that the Regional

TABLE 7.7

MORE FUNDED APPLICANTS VIEW THE RRP AS VENTURESOME THAN EITHER FIELD READERS OR NOT FUNDED APPLICANTS

RRP image	Proportion			
	Funded applicants	Not funded applicants	Field readers	Directors of Educational Research
Venturesome	.41	.05	.21	[8]*
Orthodox	.25	.63	.40	[1]
No opinion	.34	.32	.39	[0]
TOTALS	1.00 (250)	1.00 (409)	1.00 (412)	9
NA =	1	5	11	0
	251	414	423	9

*The number of DER's who gave each response appears in brackets.

> Research Program tends to be fairly strict or somewhat permissive?

Table 7.8 shows the proportion of respondents checking each of the answer options. Seven of the nine Directors are strict about expecting researchers to adhere to plans stated in their proposals, but applicants and field readers have a different impression. Almost half of the funded applicants consider the RRP fairly permissive in allowing researchers to depart from their original plans. Note too the relatively high proportion of applicants and field readers who have no opinion about this policy. It is not surprising that so many not funded applicants (69 per cent) did not express opinions. Since their proposals did not become RRP projects, they lack the experience upon which to base a judgment. In addition, 37 per cent of the funded applicants and 58 per cent of the field readers are unsure about the Program's policy for handling departures from the proposal. This finding suggests, as well as those in Tables 7.6 and 7.7, that many applicants and field readers have had too little exposure to the RRP's policies to formulate opinions about its practices and interests.

The fourth question regarding the image of the Program was:

> In comparing the procedures that an applicant must follow when submitting a proposal to the Regional Research Program with those required by other

TABLE 7.8

A MAJORITY OF THE DIRECTORS OF THE RRP ARE FAIRLY STRICT ABOUT ALLOWING DEPARTURES FROM PROPOSALS

With respect to departures from proposals, the RRP is:	Proportion Funded applicants	 Not funded applicants	 Field readers	Directors of Educational Research
Fairly strict	.17	.20	.18	[7]*
Fairly permissive	.46	.10	.24	[2]
No opinion	.37	.69	.58	[0]
TOTALS	1.00 (249)	.99 (407)	1.00 (412)	9
NA =	2	7	11	0
	251	414	423	9

*The number of DER's who gave each response appears in brackets.

> agencies, would you say the Regional Research Program involves more, about the same, or somewhat less "red tape"?

An aim of the RRP, as stated in the Guidelines, is:

> ... to provide for direct and expeditious handling of proposals.[8]

We can look to Table 7.9 to learn the success of the Program in achieving this goal. Six of the nine Directors think the Program does well. They say the RRP requires less "red tape" than other agencies. This opinion is not shared by applicants and field readers who are more likely to think of the RRP as requiring as much "red tape" as other agencies. The figures in Table 7.9 reveal that 37 per cent of the funded applicants, 36 per cent of those not funded, and 37 per cent of the field readers hold this opinion.

As discussed earlier in this report,[9] applicants, field readers, and the Directors all have suggestions for speeding up the processing of proposals. If these suggestions are implemented, we would expect

---

[8] Guidelines, op. cit., p. 1

[9] Chapter Five.

TABLE 7.9

ONE OUT OF THREE APPLICANTS AND FIELD READERS SAY THE RRP REQUIRES THE SAME AMOUNT OF "RED TAPE" AS OTHER GRANTING AGENCIES

Impression of "red tape" in RRP	Proportion			
	Funded applicants	Not funded applicants	Field readers	Directors of Educational Research
More "red tape" than other agencies	.12	.23	.10	[0]*
About the same amount	.37	.36	.37	[3]
Somewhat less	.23	.12	.20	[6]
No opinion	.28	.29	.32	[0]
TOTALS	1.00 (250)	1.00 (408)	.99 (412)	9
NA =	1	6	11	0
	251	414	423	9

*The number of DER's who gave each response appears in brackets.

a follow-up study of participants in the Program to show a higher proportion having the impression that the RRP requires "less 'red tape'" than other agencies.

Summary

This chapter has provided an overall appraisal of the USOE Regional Research Program from the perspective of applicants, field readers, and Directors of Educational Research. It has considered the review process, the present ceiling on individual grants, and the image of the Program's research interests and policies.

Both field readers and the Directors of the Program overwhelmingly favor the panel system for reviewing proposals. In addition, they recommend some changes in the present Field Reader Evaluation Form. In particular, a majority of the field readers would separate the criterion "adequacy of personnel and facilities" into two criteria, "adequacy of personnel" and "adequacy of facilities." An equally large number think a rating scale should be provided for each criterion. In general, field readers value the exposure to new research ideas that is an inherent aspect of evaluating RRP proposals; and additionally, they value the intellectual stimulation of the experience. But they are critical of the Program too. They are disturbed about the limited contact they have with the regional offices and the remuneration they receive.

Most applicants, field readers, and Directors agree that the present ceiling of $10,000 per grant should be raised. Applicants and field readers favor a ceiling closer to $15,000. The Directors have different points of view on the issue. One advocates retaining the present ceiling; another thinks there should be none; while several others favor raising the ceiling, but with a provision for varying levels of support. They think it is generally appropriate to support established researchers at a higher level than doctoral candidates for comparable projects.

Only the Directors have a clear image of the RRP's research policies. At least one-third of the applicants and field readers do not know whether the Program supports a broad or narrow range of interests in education, or whether the Program tends to be orthodox or venturesome in its support of research. These findings suggest that the Directors should not delay implementing the recommendations for better communication between the participants on the outside and the Directors in the regional offices, if the Program is to build a uniform identity.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding chapters have examined data on the experiences and opinions of key participants in the USOE Regional Research Program (RRP). Those chapters have reported how the Program operates by answering questions such as: Who applies for funds? Who receives support? What projects are proposed? What are the outcomes of the projects? How do the Directors of Educational Research, field readers, and applicants appraise the Program? In these final pages we present the strengths and weaknesses of the Program and suggest steps which can be taken by the RRP and USOE to rectify the weaknesses.

Like many other granting programs, the RRP is multi-goaled. Certainly, a central goal is "resource building." Primarily this means identifying and supporting less established researchers who seek to carry out educationally significant, small-project research. A major conclusion of the analysis is that the Program successfully achieves this objective. Whether pre- or post-doctoral, applicants who have never received a research grant are more likely than previous grant recipients to be funded. Were it not for the RRP, many of these individuals may never have proceeded with their research plans.

In various ways, the research of these beginners contributes to resource building. It enters the classroom, leads to professional publications, and strengthens interest in doing further research on education. The last effect of the research is fostered by the Program in another way. When doctoral dissertation advisors are funded, almost all of them involve students in their projects. As a result of this experience, they report that their students plan to continue in research once the project has been completed. Thus, funding dissertation advisors serves the dual function of supporting research by a professor while simultaneously attracting students to research.

In addition to resource building, the Program advances the state of educational research by attracting researchers trained in various disciplines. In this way educational problems are explored from different theoretical perspectives and by different techniques. Although a majority of applicants specialize in education, almost as many specialize in disciplines ranging from art to zoology.

These findings offer strong evidence for concluding that the Program is what it purports to be and merits continued funding. As for improvement of the Program, the following recommendations are offered:

1. The administrative budget for the Directors of Educational Research should be stabilized.
2. The research budget for small-project grants should be increased.
3. The $10,000 ceiling for individual projects should be raised to $15,000 plus overhead.
4. The panel method of review should be continued.
5. Applicants should be notified of the status of their proposals within sixty days of submission.
6. Field Reader comments should be sent to every applicant.
7. The Directors of Educational Research should offer direction to institutions in the selection of materials to expand their resources for developing proposals.
8. The Directors of Educational Research should increase their communication with both applicants and field readers.
9. The Guidelines for preparing the proposal document should be revised.
10. Periodic summaries of applicant and proposal data should be compiled.

Recommendation 1: The administrative budget for the Directors of Educational Research should be stabilized.

The most serious shortcoming of the Program is its precarious administrative budget, Unpredictable budget freezes in addition to chronic understaffing have plagued the Program since its inception and continue to diminish its effectiveness. Anyone associated with the Program knows well that although it has been in existence nearly five years, it has yet to have a normal year, that is, one free of budgetary crises.

The budget freezes and inadequate staffing in the regional offices have only negative consequences. Travel ceases. Directors cannot visit institutions in their regions to develop the research potential of institutions and individuals. Processing of proposals is suspended. Paperwork in the regional offices continues to mount. These circumstances evoke negative reactions to educational research in general and to USOE in particular. When Directors cannot circulate among institutions in their regions, what justification is there for regionalization?

In brief, unstable and insufficient administrative financing nullifies the prime advantage of regionalization--contact between RRP staff and researchers.

Despite the frustrating budgetary constraints facing the regional offices, we have been impressed by the dedication of the Program's Directors. To a considerable extent, they deserve credit for the accomplishments of the Program. However, the regional offices tend to be one-man operations. Over time, this short-sighted economy undermines the Program. To build stability into the administration of the Program, funds must be provided for clerical help, a professional assistant, and travel. It is essential that these funds be exempt from freezes. Only then can the Directors do the job for which they have been hired and for which the Program has been created.

The RRP, it appears, is not unlike many other programs at USOE which are launched and then must operate on erratic and inadequate budgets.[1] Hopefully, the Program will not be "phased out" before it has been given an opportunity to demonstrate its effectiveness.

Recommendation 2: The research budget for small-project grants should be increased.

Having studied the Program from several perspectives, we think that in addition to stabilizing the administrative budget, the funds for supporting research should be increased. Generally, if one agrees with the claim of many educators, researchers, government officials, and informed laymen that the educational system in the United States suffers from serious shortcomings, then it would seem prudent to allocate more funds to the RRP for continuing its program of resource development. Moreover, as the Program becomes known the volume of applications for research support will increase. In the final analysis, the image of the Program (and its parent organization, USOE) depends not only on how much productive research is funded but also on how much is turned away.

---

[1] A report in Science makes the following observations about USOE:

> [It is] difficult to determine which programs [at the U.S. Office of Education] are working and which are not, since many of the new programs are operating on a relative pittance.
>
> Neither Congress nor OE has done much about seriously evaluating the multitude of programs on the books and making improvements where necessary. Drafting and passing a law to create a new program is in many ways easier and politically more profitable than finding out how a program actually works and correcting flaws or abuses.

Walsh, John, "Education: Nixon Nominates a Schoolman as Commissioner," Science, 163 (February 28, 1969), 912-915.

Recommendation 3: The $10,000 ceiling for individual projects should be raised to $15,000 plus overhead.

The recommendation for increasing the research budget of the RRP has already been stated, but this increase should be large enough to provide for raising the ceiling on individual grants to $15,000 plus overhead. This increment would help compensate for inflated project costs. However, the major benefit would be greater flexibility in the choice of problems to be studied and research design.

A higher ceiling would permit the collection of data not otherwise possible. At present many RRP projects use students as subjects, but few study the context of the learning environment--the classroom as a whole, the school, the home, or the community. Studies of this scope typically require a larger expenditure than the $10,000 now awarded.

The recommendation to raise the ceiling on individual projects should not jeopardize the Program's commitment to unsolicited, small-project research. By keeping the individual awards at a modest level, more researchers can be supported, and the RRP is one of the few federal programs providing the researcher on education with an opportunity to explore the idea he has developed.

Recommendation 4: The panel method of review should be continued.

Chapter Seven provided considerable data on two systems for reviewing proposals (by panel or by correspondence). The majority of field readers and Directors consider the panel to be superior. Occasionally, technical proposals are best reviewed by specialists. When necessary, such reviews can be obtained by mail and then submitted to a panel to permit evaluating the merit of these proposals relative to the others being considered.

Recommendation 5: Applicants should be notified of the status of their proposals within sixty days of submission.

One aim of the Program is:

> Processing of proposals from receipt to notification of action is usually completed within two months, except when complications beyond the control of the Regional Office arise.[2]

---

[2] Guidelines, op. cit., p. 6.

This statement leads to unrealistic expectations. Two-thirds of the applicants state that notification took longer than they had expected.[3] Marginal comments in their questionnaires dramatize the irritation produced by the delay. We recommend that within sixty days of submitting his proposal the applicant be informed of the funding decision, or the expected date of that decision. The dividends from this procedure would be substantial.

Recommendation 6: Field reader comments should be sent to every applicant.

When the applicant is notified of the disposition of his proposal, the notification should be accompanied by a copy of the field reader comments. Applicants are eager for constructive criticism and field readers themselves endorse the idea. Although the opinions of the Directors diverge on this point, those who have not adopted the practice are willing to give it consideration.

In sending comments to applicants, the identity of field readers need not be revealed.[4] His interests can be protected by revising the Field Reader Evaluation Form and informing him that his comments will be sent to the applicants. A form could be designed that would provide space below a perforation for comments addressed to applicants and space above for those intended for USOE exclusively.

Recommendation 7: The Directors of Educational Research should offer direction to institutions in the selection of materials to expand their resources for developing proposals.

Although the Directors conduct seminars, clinics, and individual conferences with prospective applicants, we suggest that they also endeavor to assist these applicants by providing guidance to institutions in the acquisition of resource materials. To be specific, one of the findings reported in Chapter Four was that the probability of being funded appears to be related to the number of resources available to applicants--not the number they use in developing their proposals. Whether an applicant uses a particular resource depends on a number of factors, possibly his research training, his experience in writing proposals, or the stage of his research plan. The important factor is the availability of resources at the institution. The wider the range of choice, the greater the opportunity for the researcher to select those appropriate to his needs.

---

[3] Table 5.1.

[4] It should be noted that the issue of concealed identity is not salient to field readers. Not one commented on it in the questionnaire.

By way of a reminder, these are the resources which are listed in the applicant questionnaire:

1. An "information bank" of agencies that fund research
2. Sample application forms of funding agencies
3. A "resource person" knowledgeable about applying for research funds
4. Copies of proposals submitted by others
5. ERIC materials
6. USOE's "Guidelines for Small Project Research"
7. USOE's "Winning a Research Bid: Tips on Proposal Writing."

We recommend that the Directors guide institutional efforts to secure these resources--most of which are not costly or difficult to obtain. With such materials available, applicants have a greater chance of successfully competing for research funds.[5]

Recommendation 8: The Directors of Educational Research should increase their communication with both applicants and field readers.

The Directors seem to have a uniform image of the Program's research policies and practices, but a great many applicants and field readers do not know whether the Program is narrow or broad in its interests, whether it is orthodox or venturesome, or whether it is strict or lenient in allowing departures from the research plans stated in proposals. These findings point up a gap in communications. If the Program is to build an identity, the Directors must bridge the gap by providing better and more frequent information to field readers and applicants.

The value that can be derived from improving the relationship of field readers to the Program should not be overlooked. Their specialized knowledge and skills could help the Directors further Program aims. However, field readers cannot be helpful unless they are kept up-to-date on the Program's activities. Informal discussions could be held when panels are convened, or at periodic regional meetings, or even at the annual AERA (American Educational Research Association) convention which is probably attended by a large proportion of field readers.

---

[5] A summary of some material from this report might also be useful to prospective applicants.

Finally, field readers ought to be notified of the outcomes of the proposals they review. Many admit to a certain frustration in spending time evaluating a proposal and never hearing the granting decision. We recommend that field readers be sent an annual summary of awards listing the project director, the institution, and the title of each study. This would not only inform them of the outcomes of the proposals they had reviewed, but it would also acquaint them with the Program's overall activities. In addition, such a summary would be a convenient way to maintain contact with past and present grantees.

Recommendation 9: The "Guidelines" for preparing the proposal document should be revised.

The section of the Guidelines entitled "The Proposal Document" states that applicants should "outline the proposed research procedures carefully."[6] As it turns out, many do not. Typical of this lack of specificity is the fact that one-third of the researchers who plan to study students do not state an approximate sample size. Further, the Guidelines do not explicitly request a statement about the planned modes of analysis, and one-fourth of the applicants fail to provide this information. In conjunction with this, applicants neglect to state the data processing techniques they intend to use.

These omissions point up the need to revise the Guidelines.[7] The simple injunction to "outline carefully" is an empty instruction unless applicants (particularly those who have never previously sought a grant) are told what facts to present in the outline.

Recommendation 10: Periodic summaries of applicant and proposal data should be compiled.

To provide an overview of each fiscal year, we suggest a periodic compilation of data from applicants. This need be neither expensive nor elaborate. With slight modification, the application form could serve as the collection instrument. These items would be useful: educational background, present position, type of institutional affiliation, major field of interest. In addition, there should be a fact sheet for the proposed research which covers subject matter, study design, expected outcome (other than the final report) and, where applicable, sample characteristics and total costs by item.[8] Some of the questions and codes developed for this study could be adapted for this purpose. By summarizing these facts, the Directors would be informed of the consequences of their decisions. They would learn who is being attracted, and the nature of the problems being studied. They may discover areas that are underrepresented or not represented at all and, as a result, they may wish to devote attention to arousing interest in these areas among researchers. In sum, the profile of the Program that is being suggested here would facilitate planning and provide a basis for policy revisions.

---

[6] Guidelines, op. cit., p. 3.

[7] Although the Guidelines have been revised and reissued as recently as October, 1970, the section entitled, "The Proposal Document," has not been materially altered since July, 1968.

One further comment about the recommendations. We have presented only those we consider most important, but all of the research reported here offers possibilities for re-examining and improving the Program. It is our hope that the Directors will use these materials for just this purpose.

---

[8] Subsequent to this study, a taxonomy for proposal data has been developed. See Richard V. McCann, "A Data Base and Data Flow Model for the Regional Research Program," NCERD, USOE, mimeo, November, 1970. Perhaps a similar one will be developed for applicant data.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE

The data for this study of the USOE Regional Research Program (RRP) were obtained from two primary sources. Both the applicants submitting proposals to the RRP in Fiscal 1968 and the field readers reviewing these proposals were surveyed by mail questionnaire between July, 1969 and May, 1970.

Applicant sample. In July, 1969 a 23-page printed questionnaire consisting of nearly 100 items was mailed to researchers who had applied to the RRP for a grant during Fiscal 1968. Since everyone had not received support, a different version of the questionnaire was sent to funded applicants (N = 289) than to not funded applicants (N = 585). The total sample size was 874.

On September 1, the return rate was only 36 per cent. Follow-up postcards were then mailed to all applicants who had not returned completed questionnaires. By September 23, the return rate had reached 46 per cent, somewhat of an improvement, but still not acceptable.

Thereafter, efforts to persuade applicants to complete their questionnaires were individualized. In most cases, a personally-typed letter was air mailed to the remaining applicants. The letter stressed the importance of the applicant's participation in the survey and invited him to return an enclosed postcard requesting another questionnaire, if somehow the original one had gone astray. These letters were effective: close to 50 per cent of these applicants either completed the questionnaire or returned the postcard.

In addition to letter-writing, contacts by telephone were started. Applicants in the New York City area served as test cases, and soon thereafter applicants in every region were telephoned. In all, some fifty applicants were contacted in this way. Telephoning was, of course, more costly and time consuming than letter-writing, but it was also more effective. In the end, 85 per cent of the applicants who were telephoned completed their questionnaires.

About fifteen applicants who had not been funded belong in a special group. Instead of completing their questionnaires, they sent indignant letters. They had no interest in answering questions about their proposals which had been so rudely turned down. Each of these applicants was telephoned to urge him to use the questionnaire for registering his complaints. Only one of these applicants refused to take advantage of this opportunity.

In all, 665 questionnaires were returned. The return rate for funded applicants was 89 per cent and for the not funded, 73 per cent. Table A.1 below accounts for the 874 questionnaires which were mailed.

TABLE A.1

APPLICANT SAMPLE

Questionnaires mailed		Number of applicants
Returned and processed		665
Not returned		177
Dropped from sample:		32
Withdrawals and transfers[1]	12	
Multiple proposals[2]	11	
Deaths	5	
Unlocatables	4	
	32	
TOTAL MAILED		874

[1] After mailing questionnaires it was learned that the proposals submitted by these applicants had been withdrawn or transferred to another bureau within USOE.

[2] Eleven individuals had submitted two proposals in Fiscal 1968, but alternate respondents could not be secured.

Data from non-respondents has not been completely lost. Partial profiles have been obtained from the proposals they submitted. Comparison of the non-respondent data with that provided by respondents (Table A.2) shows that respondents and non-respondents are alike in three respects:

1. Cooperating institution. A total of 84 per cent of the respondents and 85 per cent of the non-respondents listed a college or university as the cooperating institution;

TABLE A.2

COMPARISON BETWEEN RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS IN APPLICANT SURVEY

Information available for both groups	Proportion:			
	Respondents		Non-respondents	
1. Cooperating institution				
College or university	.84		.85	
School system	.10		.08	
Other (e.g., private agency)	.06		.07	
TOTALS	1.00	(665)	1.00	(156)
NA =		0		21
		665		177
2. Employment status				
Employed at least part-time	.89		.89	
Student full-time	.10		.11	
Other (e.g., post-doctoral fellow)	.01		---	
TOTALS	1.00	(665)	1.00	(168)
NA =		0		9
		665		177
3. Highest degree				
Ph.D.	.37		.41	
Ed.D.	.17		.14	
Other (e.g., M.A., M.Ed.)	.46		.45	
TOTALS	1.00	(660)	1.00	(164)
NA =		5		13
		665		177
4. Position				
Full professor	.18		.25	
Associate professor	.19		.15	
Assistant professor	.24		.18	
Other faculty (e.g., lecturer)	.05		.08	
Research director	.07		.07	
Administrative officer	.07		.09	
Other (e.g., lower school teacher)	.20		.17	
TOTALS	1.00	(596)	.99	(149)
NA =		2		9
Not employed		67		19
		665		177

2. Employment. At the time the proposal was submitted, 89 per cent of both the respondents and the non-respondents were employed at least part-time;

3. Highest degree. In Fiscal 1968, 37 per cent of the respondents held Ph.D.'s; 17 per cent, Ed.D.'s; and 46 per cent, other degrees (e.g., M.A., B.A.). The percentage figures are similar for non-respondents: 41 per cent held Ph.D.'s; 14 per cent, Ed.D.'s; and 45 per cent, other degrees.

Faculty status is the one item which shows a difference between respondents and non-respondents. A higher proportion of junior than senior faculty members cooperated in the survey, suggesting that the Program is of more interest to junior faculty members. Among respondents, 24 per cent were assistant professors, but only 18 per cent were full professors. For the non-respondents, the figures are reversed: 18 per cent were assistant professors, and 25 per cent, full professors.

Field Reader sample. Late in March, 1970, an 11-page mimeographed questionnaire was mailed to 512 field readers, the evaluators of the proposals submitted to the RRP during Fiscal 1968. The response to this questionnaire was prompt and gratifying. By the end of April, 73 per cent of the field readers had completed questionnaires. Early in May a personally-typed follow-up letter was sent by air mail to those who had not returned questionnaires. As with the letter to the applicants, this letter urged field readers to take part in the study; it also added that if the questionnaire had gone astray, the field reader could return the enclosed postcard requesting another. This single follow-up effort increased the return rate to 85 per cent (423 questionnaires).[1]

Data abstracted from USOE Field Reader Catalogs permit comparison of the present position, highest degree, degree specialty, and year degree awarded for respondents and non-respondents. As Table A.3 shows, there is no difference in the types of positions held. Ed.D.'s are slightly over-represented among the respondents and Ph.D.'s slightly under-represented. This 5 per cent difference carries over to degree specialty. A higher proportion of respondents than non-respondents specialize in education and a lower proportion in psychology and surprisingly, in English as well. Finally, both groups of field readers tend to be young, having received their highest degrees within the last ten to fifteen years. The median year for respondents is 1955 and for non-respondents, 1954. The Program's ability to attract young people is not limited to applicants; it extends to field

---

[1] The corrected sample size is 498. Seven field readers could not be located and another seven were erroneously sent questionnaires.

TABLE A.3

COMPARISON BETWEEN RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS IN FIELD READER SURVEY

Background data	Proportion:	
	Respondents	Non-respondents
1. Position		
Full professor	.51	.53
Associate professor	.11	.10
Assistant professor	.04	.03
Other faculty (e.g., lecturer)	.03	.02
Research director	.07	.08
Administrative officer	.18	.16
Other (e.g., counselor)	.07	.09
TOTALS	1.01 (396)	1.01 (61)
NA =	26	14
Retired	1	0
	423	75
2. Highest degree		
Ph.D.	.64	.69
Ed.D.	.26	.21
Other (e.g., M.A.)	.11	.10
TOTALS	1.01 (393)	1.00 (62)
NA =	30	13
	423	75
3. Degree specialty		
Education	.44	.24
Psychology	.26	.38
Sociology	.07	.02
Other social science	.06	.07
Mathematics, physical and biological sciences	.07	.05
English and language arts	.06	.24
Music and art	.04	---
TOTALS	1.00 (259)	1.00 (42)
NA =	164	33
	423	75

[continued]

Table A.3 [continued]

Comparison Between Respondents and Non-Respondents in Field Reader Survey

Background data	Cumulative proportion: Respondents	Cumulative proportion: Non-respondents
4. Year of degree		
1924-1939	.10	.05
1940-1949	.26	.26
1950-1954	.47	.53
1955-1959	.72	.79
1960-1964	.93	.95
1965-1968	1.00	1.00
TOTALS	(358)	(58)
NA =	65	17
	423	75
MEDIANS	1955	1954

readers. Thus, if there is any bias in the analysis, it is in favor of youth, the hallmark of the Program.

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE B1.1

FIVE OUT OF SIX DOCTORAL STUDENTS ARE WORKING TOWARD DEGREES IN EDUCATION

Degree specialty	Expected degree[+]	Proportion of students working toward doctorate	
Education	Ph.D.	.50	
	Ed.D.	.37	
Discipline	Ph.D.	.13	
		1.00	(113)
		Cases excluded[*]	464
		NA =	88
			665

[+] Table restricted to applicants listing the doctorate earned in 1968 or 1969 as the highest degree.

[*] Not working toward advanced degree.

TABLE B1.2

FOUR OUT OF FIVE DOCTORAL STUDENTS INTEND THE RRP RESEARCH FOR THEIR DISSERTATIONS

Status	Proportion of applicants intending RRP research for dissertation	Number of applicants
Student		
Working toward Ed.D.	.83	(71)
Working toward Ph.D.	.80	(121)
Working toward Master's degree	.33	(9)
Not a student	.06	(459)
TOTAL	.28	(660)
	NA =	5
		665

TABLE B1.3

NINETY-SEVEN PER CENT OF THE APPLICANTS ARE WHITE

Race of applicant	Proportion of applicants
White	.97
Negro	.02
Other (e.g., Indian, Oriental)	.01
TOTAL	1.00 (644)
	NA = 21
	665

TABLE B1.4

FIVE OUT OF SIX APPLICANTS ARE MALE

Sex of applicant	Proportion of applicants
Male	.83
Female	.17
TOTAL	1.00 (665)

TABLE B1.5

NINE OUT OF TEN APPLICANTS ARE MARRIED

Marital status of applicant	Proportion of applicants	
Married	.92	
Not married	.08	
TOTAL	1.00	(638)
	NA =	27
		665

TABLE B1.6

APPLICANTS TYPICALLY HAVE BETWEEN TWO AND THREE DEPENDENTS

Number of dependents*	Cumulative proportion
None	.15
One	.29
Two	.44
Three	.71
Four	.88
Five or more	1.00
TOTAL	(655)
	NA = 10
	665
MEDIAN	2.74

*Other than self.

TABLE B1.7

THE MEDIAN AGE OF APPLICANTS IS APPROXIMATELY THIRTY-EIGHT

Year of birth	Cumulative proportion
Before 1910	.04
1910 - 1919	.16
1920 - 1924	.28
1925 - 1929	.50
1930 - 1934	.73
1935 - 1939	.92
1940 - 1945	1.00
TOTAL	(659)
	NA = 6
	665
MEDIAN	1929

TABLE B1.8

IN 1968, THE MEDIAN INCOME OF APPLICANTS WAS $14,000

Income for 1968	Cumulative proportion
Under $5,000	.06
$5,000 - $7,499	.11
$7,500 - $9,999	.21
$10,000 - $14,999	.59
$15,000 - $19,999	.85
$20,000 - $24,999	.97
$25,000 - $29,999	.99
$30,000 or more	1.00
TOTAL	(642)
	NA = 23
	665
MEDIAN	$13,765

TABLE B1.9

IN 1969, THE MEDIAN INCOME OF APPLICANTS WAS $16,000

Income for 1969	Cumulative proportion
Under $5,000	.02
$5,000 - $7,499	.04
$7,500 - $9,999	.10
$10,000 - $14,999	.43
$15,000 - $19,999	.75
$20,000 - $24,999	.92
$25,000 - $29,999	.97
$30,000 or more	1.00
TOTAL	(641)
	NA = 24
	665
MEDIAN	$16,071

TABLE B1.10

THE PARENTS OF TWO-THIRDS OF THE APPLICANTS HAD NO MORE THAN A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

Formal education	Parents of applicant [Cumulative proportion] Father	Parents of applicant [Cumulative proportion] Mother
Eighth grade or less	.29	.23
Some high school	.44	.37
Completed high school	.63	.66
Some college	.78	.83
Graduated from college	.86	.94
Some graduate school	.88	.96
First professional degree	.93	.98
Master's degree	.97	.99
Ph.D. or Ed.D.	1.00	1.00
TOTAL	(645)	(647)
NA =	20	18
	665	665

TABLE B2.1

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS FUNDED BY PREVIOUS RESEARCH GRANTS

Number of previous research grant(s)	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
None	.43	(249)
One or more	.34	(407)
TOTAL	.38	(656)
	NA =	9
		665

TABLE B3.1

THE SUBJECT MATTER OF PROPOSALS VARIES

Detailed classification of subject matter	Number of proposals
Agriculture	6
Art (graphics, painting, sculpture)	10
Building design	1
Business	7
Education (administration, finance, history of, teacher training)	166
English (cinema, literature, speech, theatre)	37
Foreign languages and linguistics	12
Home economics	5
Industrial arts	6
Information processing (data retrieval systems, library)	20
Mathematics and statistics	37
Music	28
Physical education, health, and recreation (dancing)	24
Physiological measurements	5
Psychology (including testing and measurement, counseling, guidance and placement)	193
Reading	30
Science (biological, environmental, or physical)	35
Social science (including area studies, and international relations)	38
Speech pathology and audiology	8
Behavioral science research, environmental focus	28
Subject not elsewhere classified (e.g., Headstart, aviation)	11
Not classifiable by subject (e.g., student activism)	3
TOTAL	710*

*Total exceeds 665 because more than one subject was indicated in some proposals.

TABLE B3.2

THE SAMPLE SIZE FOR STUDENT GROUPS VARIES

Sample size	Proportion of proposals	
50 or less	.20	
51 - 100	.20	
101 - 200	.21	
201 - 500	.21	
501 or more	.18	
TOTAL	1.00	(249)
Not specified		128
Not applicable		288
		665

TABLE B3.3

WHEN STUDENTS ARE STUDIED, RACE OR ETHNICITY IS SELDOM SPECIFIED

Race or ethnicity of students	Proportion of proposals	
Caucasian	.50	
Negro	.48	
Oriental	.14	
American Indian	.09	
Mexican-American	.05	
Other-foreign	.16	
TOTAL	1.42*	(56)
Not specified		321
Not applicable		288
		665

*Total exceeds 1.00 because more than one racial or ethnic group indicated.

TABLE B3.4

FEW PROPOSALS FOCUSING ON STUDENTS SPECIFY THE STUDENT'S ECONOMIC LEVEL

Economic level	Proportion of proposals	
Welfare or poverty	.45	
Low-income	.48	
Middle-income	.45	
Upper-income	.09	
TOTAL	1.47*	(58)
Not specified		319
Not applicable		288
		665

*Total exceeds 1.00 because more than one economic group indicated.

TABLE B3.5

LESS THAN ONE-HALF OF THE PROPOSALS FOCUSING ON TEACHERS SPECIFY THE SAMPLE SIZE

Sample size	Proportion of proposals	
50 or less	.37	
51 - 150	.31	
200 or more	.31	
TOTAL	.99	(35)
Not specified		42
Not applicable		588
		665

TABLE B3.6

TOTAL COST FOR BUDGET ITEMS

Total cost for budget item*	Budget Item					
	Non-professional personnel		Services and final report		Equipment	
	[cumulative proportions]					
$105 or less	.02		.06		.11	
106 - 205	.09		.17		.21	
206 - 305	.17		.25		.31	
306 - 405	.24		.36		.38	
406 - 505	.35		.45		.46	
506 - 605	.43		.50		.51	
606 - 705	.46		.58		.54	
706 - 805	.51		.63		.56	
806 - 905	.57		.67		.58	
906 - 994	.59		.69		.59	
995 - 1,994	.84		.89		.80	
1,995 - 2,994	.95		.93		.87	
2,995 - 3,994	.98		.96		.92	
3,995 and over	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Number of proposals		(459)		(545)		(165)
No cost listed	.20	112	.05	26	.71	406
TOTAL		(571)		(571)		(571)
MEDIAN	$782		$609		$590	
No budget available		13		13		13
No local amount stated		81		81		81
		665		665		665

[continued]

---

*Budget item costs recorded to the nearest ten dollars.

Table B3.6 [continued]

Total Cost for Budget Items

Total cost for budget item*	Budget Item					
	Travel		Employee Benefits		Supplies and materials	
	[cumulative proportions]					
$105 or less	.14		.15		.20	
106 - 205	.29		.31		.40	
206 - 305	.40		.39		.54	
306 - 405	.49		.55		.62	
406 - 505	.56		.65		.68	
506 - 605	.63		.75		.74	
606 - 705	.67		.83		.78	
706 - 805	.73		.88		.82	
806 - 905	.77		.91		.85	
906 - 994	.80		.92		.87	
995 - 1,994	.92		.98		.94	
1,995 - 2,994	.96		.99		.97	
2,995 - 3,994	.98		.99		.98	
3,995 and over	1.00		1.00		1.00	
Number of proposals		(443)		(457)		(543)
No cost listed	.22	128	.20	114	.05	28
TOTAL		(571)		(571)		(571)
MEDIAN	$420		$374		$276	
No budget available		13		13		13
No local amount stated		81		81		81
		665		665		665

[continued]

---

*Budget item costs recorded to the nearest ten dollars.

Table B3.6 [continued]

Total Cost for Budget Items

Total cost for budget item*	Budget Item Communication [cumulative proportions]	
$25 or less	.14	
26 - 45	.19	
46 - 65	.39	
66 - 85	.47	
86 - 105	.62	
106 - 205	.83	
206 - 305	.90	
306 - 405	.92	
406 - 605	.97	
606 - 805	.98	
806 - 994	.99	
995 - 2,994	1.00	
Number of proposals		(381)
No cost listed	.33	190
TOTAL		(571)
MEDIAN	$90	
No budget available		13
No local amount stated		81
		665

[continued]

---

*Budget item costs recorded to nearest ten dollars.

Table B3.6 [continued]

Total Cost for Budget Items

Total amount for item*	Budget Item		
	Professional personnel	Indirect costs	Local contribution
	[cumulative proportions]		
$994 or less	.02	.17	.25
995 - 1,994	.06	.45	.48
1,995 - 2,994	.13	.77	.64
2,995 - 3,994	.25	.91	.70
3,995 - 4,994	.41	.96	.77
4,995 - 5,994	.57	.98	.86
5,995 - 6,994	.69	.98	.86
6,995 - 7,994	.79	.99	.88
7,995 - 8,994	.85	.99	.90
8,995 - 9,994	.90	.99	.92
9,995 and over	1.00	1.00	1.00
Number of proposals	(571)	(508)	(571)
No cost listed	---	.12 63	---
TOTAL	(571)	(571)	(571)
MEDIAN	$5,578	$2,152	$2,104
No budget available	13	13	13
No local amount stated	81	81	81
	665	665	665

[continued]

*Budget amounts recorded to the nearest ten dollars.

Table B3.6 [continued]

Total Cost for Budget Items

Federal funds requested*	Budget Item	
	Comparable budgets	All proposals
	[cumulative proportions]	
$994 or less	.00	.00
995 - 1,994	.01	.01
1,995 - 2,994	.03	.04
2,995 - 3,994	.07	.07
3,995 - 4,994	.11	.11
4,995 - 5,994	.15	.16
5,995 - 6,994	.22	.22
6,995 - 7,994	.28	.29
7,995 - 8,994	.40	.41
8,995 - 9,994	.80	.81
9,995 and over	1.00	1.00
Number of proposals	(571)	(664)
MEDIAN	$9,257	$9,230
No amount available		1
No budget available	13	
No local amount stated	81	
	665	665

[continued]

---

*Amount recorded to nearest ten dollars.

Table B3.6 [continued]

Total Cost for Budget Items

Total budget*	Funded	Not Funded	Total
	[cumulative proportions]		
$5,005 or less	.07	.05	.06
5,006 - 7,505	.16	.14	.15
7,506 - 10,005	.32	.30	.31
10,006 - 11,005	.47	.47	.47
11,006 - 12,005	.59	.63	.62
12,006 - 13,005	.67	.73	.71
13,006 - 14,005	.72	.76	.75
14,006 - 15,005	.77	.82	.80
15,006 - 17,505	.86	.91	.89
17,506 - 20,005	.90	.93	.92
20,006 - 22,505	.94	.95	.94
22,506 - 25,005	.96	.97	.97
$25,006 and over	1.00	1.00	1.00
Number of proposals	(221)	(350)	(571)
MEDIAN	$11,256	$11,166	$11,194
No budget available	2	11	13
No local amount stated	28	53	81
	665	665	665

*Amounts upon which total is based are recorded to nearest ten dollars.

TABLE B4.1

APPLICANTS WITH MORE THAN THREE RESOURCES AVAILABLE HAVE A BETTER CHANCE OF BEING FUNDED

Number of resources available	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
One	.36	(113)
Two	.38	(104)
Three	.34	(143)
Four	.46	(99)
Five	.45	(78)
Six or seven	.41	(84)
TOTAL	.38	(621)
No resources available		31
NA =		13
		665

TABLE B4.2

THE DIRECTOR OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH IS USUALLY THE USOE OFFICIAL WITH WHOM APPLICANTS DISCUSS THEIR PROPOSALS

USOE official contacted	Proportion of applicants
Director of Educational Research	.68
Staff member, Washington, D.C.	.21
Director of Educational Research and a staff member in Washington, D.C.	.07
Other (e.g., regional intern)	.04
TOTAL	1.00 (266)
Not discussed with USOE	392
NA =	7
	665

TABLE B4.3

ALMOST ALL FUNDED APPLICANTS FIND DISCUSSING THEIR PROPOSALS WITH A USOE OFFICIAL HELPFUL

Find discussion with USOE official helpful?	Proportion of applicants	
	Funded	Not funded
Yes	.96	.64
No	.04	.36
TOTAL	1.00 (107)	1.00 (103)
No discussion with USOE	134	258
NA =	10	23
	251	414 (665)

TABLE B4.4

APPLICANTS TYPICALLY SPEND ABOUT FORTY-EIGHT HOURS PREPARING THEIR PROPOSALS

Number of hours spent preparing proposal	Cumulative proportion
20 or less	.17
21 - 40	.44
41 - 60	.61
61 - 80	.70
81 - 100	.83
101 or more	1.00
TOTAL	(628)
NA =	37
	665
MEDIAN	47.5 hours

TABLE B4.5

APPLICANTS WHO SPEND LESS THAN TWENTY HOURS PREPARING THEIR PROPOSALS ARE LEAST LIKELY TO BE FUNDED

Number of hours spent preparing proposal	Proportion of applicants funded	Number of applicants
20 or less	.33	(106)
21 - 40	.35	(169)
41 - 60	.41	(108)
61 - 80	.38	(55)
81 - 100	.38	(82)
101 or more	.39	(108)
TOTAL	.38	(628)
	NA =	37
		665

TABLE B4.6

A MAJORITY OF THE APPLICANTS PREPARE PROPOSALS ON THEIR OWN TIME

Time used to prepare proposal	Proportion of applicants
Own time	.53
Both own and working time	.28
Working time	.19
TOTAL	1.00 (658)
	NA = 7
	665

TABLE B4.7

THE MEDIAN CLERICAL COST FOR PREPARING A PROPOSAL IS $48

Clerical costs	Cumulative proportion	
Less than $25	.22	
$25 - $49	.53	
$50 - $99	.80	
$100 or more	1.00	
TOTAL		(619)
Cannot guess the cost		41
NA =		5
		665
MEDIAN		$48

TABLE B5.1

SEVEN OUT OF TEN NOT FUNDED APPLICANTS ASK FOR AN EXPLANATION OF THE GRANTING DECISION

Did you ask for an explanation?	Proportion of not funded applicants
Yes	.71
No	.29
TOTAL	1.00 (409)
NA =	5
Cases excluded*	251
	665

*Funded applicants.

TABLE B5.2

FOUR OUT OF FIVE NOT FUNDED APPLICANTS ARE DISSATISFIED WITH THE EXPLANATION OF THE GRANTING DECISION

Satisfaction with explanation of decision	Proportion of not funded applicants
Not satisfied	.81
Fairly satisfied	.17
Very satisfied	.02
TOTAL	1.00 (264)
NA =	29
Did not ask for an explanation	121
Cases excluded*	251
	665

*Funded applicants.

TABLE B6.1

MOST RRP PROJECTS WERE NEARLY COMPLETED OR COMPLETED AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY

Stage of research project	Proportion of funded applicants
Grant just received	.02
One-fourth completed	.01
One-half completed	.08
Three-fourths completed	.13
Nearly completed	.28
Completed	.48
TOTAL	1.00 (249)
NA =	2
Cases excluded*	414
	665

*Not funded applicants.

TABLE B6.2

TWO OUT OF THREE RRP PROJECTS HAVE STUDENT ASSISTANTS

Student assistance on project?	Proportion of funded applicants
Yes	.66
No	.34
TOTAL	1.00 (250)
NA =	1
Cases excluded*	414
	665

*Not funded applicants.

TABLE B6.3

TWO-THIRDS OF THE FUNDED APPLICANTS PRESENT PAPERS BASED ON THEIR PROJECTS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

Present a paper at a professional meeting?	Proportion of funded applicants
Yes	.67
No	.33
TOTAL	1.00 (222)
Cases excluded*	443
	665

*Not funded applicants (N = 414); funded applicants whose project has just begun (N = 29).

TABLE B6.4

SIX OUT OF TEN FUNDED APPLICANTS PRESENT PAPERS BASED ON THEIR PROJECTS AT NATIONAL MEETINGS OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

Type of meeting	Proportion of funded applicants
National meeting	.45
Regional meeting	.13
Invited lecture	.11
State meeting	.09
National, regional, and state meeting	.07
Regional and state meeting	.06
National and state meeting	.05
National and regional meeting	.04
International meeting	.03
TOTAL	1.03* (155)
No paper presented	67
Cases excluded**	443
	665

*Total exceeds 1.00 because some funded applicants also present papers at international meetings.

**Not funded applicants (N = 414); funded applicants whose project has just begun (N = 29).

TABLE B6.5

SEVEN OUT OF TEN FUNDED APPLICANTS PREPARE MANUSCRIPTS FOR PUBLICATION BASED ON THEIR PROJECTS

Prepare a manuscript for publication?	Proportion of funded applicants
Yes	.72
No	.28
TOTAL	1.00 (222)
Cases excluded*	443
	665

*Not funded applicants (N = 414); funded applicants whose project has just begun (N = 29).

TABLE B6.6

FUNDED APPLICANTS MOST FREQUENTLY WRITE JOURNAL ARTICLES BASED ON THEIR PROJECTS

Type of manuscript(s)	Proportion of funded applicants	
Journal article	.72	
Journal article and book or part of a book	.11	
Book or part of a book	.06	
Other (e.g., limited circulation report, musical score, test manual)	.08	
Journal article and other	.01	
Book or part of a book and other	.01	
Journal article, book or part of a book, and other	.01	
TOTAL	1.00	(171)
No plans to publish		51
Cases excluded*		443
		665

*Not funded applicants (N = 414); funded applicants whose project has just begun (N = 29).

TABLE B6.7

SEVEN OUT OF TEN FUNDED APPLICANTS REPORT THAT RRP EXPERIENCE HAS STRENGTHENED THEIR INTEREST IN RESEARCH ON EDUCATION

Effect of funding on research interest	Proportion of funded applicants
Strengthened interest in doing research on education	.71
No appreciable effect	.26
Diminished interest	.03
TOTAL	1.00 (248)
NA =	3
Cases excluded*	414
	665

*Not funded applicants.

TABLE B6.8

THREE OUT OF FOUR FUNDED APPLICANTS REMAIN AT THE SAME INSTITUTION AFTER STARTING THEIR RESEARCH

Institutional affiliation	Proportion of funded applicants
Same	.75
Different	.25
TOTAL	1.00 (232)
NA =	5
Not employed	14
Cases excluded*	414
	665

*Not funded applicants.

TABLE B7.1

FOUR OUT OF FIVE FIELD READERS WHO REVIEWED PROPOSALS DURING FISCAL YEAR 1968 ARE STILL FIELD READERS*

Currently under contract to USOE as a field reader?		Proportion of field readers
Yes		.82
No		.18
	TOTAL	1.00 (416)
		NA = 7
		423

*June, 1970.

TABLE B7.2

VIRTUALLY EVERY FIELD READER HAS SERVED AS AN INDIVIDUAL REVIEWER

Reviewed RRP proposals as an individual field reader?		Proportion of field readers
Yes		.99
No		.01
	TOTAL	1.00 (375)
		NA = 48
		423

TABLE B7.3

ONLY ONE OUT OF FOUR FIELD READERS HAS PARTICIPATED IN A PANEL MEETING

Participation in panel meeting?	Proportion of field readers	
Yes	.27	
No	.73	
TOTAL	1.00	(419)
	NA =	4
		423

TABLE B7.4

ONE OUT OF THREE FIELD READERS PREFER THE PANEL SYSTEM FOR REVIEWING PROPOSALS

Preferred system for reviewing RRP proposals	Proportion of field readers	
At a panel session	.33	
By correspondence	.07	
Cannot compare the two systems	.60	
TOTAL	1.00	(398)
	NA =	25
		423

TABLE B7.5

SOME FIELD READERS APPROVE ADDING CRITERIA TO THE FOUR NOW USED TO EVALUATE PROPOSALS

Additional criteria	Proportion of field readers approving
Suitability for replication	.56
Significance beyond education	.47
Creativity of researcher	.42
TOTAL	1.45* (161)
	NA = 262
	423

*Total exceeds 1.00 because field readers could recommend more than one criterion.

STUDY OF
SMALL-PROJECTS PROGRAM

Supported by
United States Office of Education

Columbia University
Bureau of Applied Social Research
605 West 115th Street
New York, New York 10025

176

STUDY OF SMALL-PROJECTS PROGRAM

This questionnaire is directed to the grant you received from the U.S. Office of Education for the project entitled:

Position on project . . . .
Title

Name *(Please print)* . . . .

First, we would like to learn about your professional activities.

1-6/

1. In the last **five** years have you been engaged in any other research projects?

Please check for each of the years listed below

		Engaged in Research on Education (1)	*Engaged in Research Other Than Education* (2)	*Not Engaged in Research* (0)
1968	7/	☐	☐	☐
1967	8/	☐	☐	☐
1966	9/	☐	☐	☐
1965	10/	☐	☐	☐
1964	11/	☐	☐	☐

2. Have you ever received another research grant from any of the following sources?

Check all that apply

12/ 1 ☐ USOE
2 ☐ Another government agency
3 ☐ A private foundation
4 ☐ Your own institution
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .
0 ☐ No grant received

3. What cooperating institution was listed on the title page of your proposal?

22/ 1 ☐ College or University . . . .
Name *City and State*

(a) To what subdivision did you belong?

Check as many as apply

24/ 1 ☐ School or Department of Education
2 ☐ Liberal Arts Department . . . .
Discipline
3 ☐ Research Institute or Bureau
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

(b) **If an instructional unit**: Was the enrollment of the division undergraduate or graduate students, or was it both?

25/ 1 ☐ Undergraduate
2 ☐ Graduate
3 ☐ Joint undergraduate/graduate

2 ☐ State Department of Education . . . .
State

3 ☐ School System . . . .
Name *City and State*

4 ☐ Private Agency . . . .
Name *City and State*

9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

4. At the time you submitted this proposal, what was your employment status?

Check as many as apply

26/ 1 ☐ Employed full-time
2 ☐ Employed part-time
3 ☐ Graduate student full-time
4 ☐ Graduate student part-time
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

If Employed

(a) 1 ☐ At cooperating institution
27/ **Or**
2 ☐ Elsewhere . . . .
Name of Institution

(b) Beginning date of employment . . . .
Year
28-29/

(c) Position when submitted proposal

. . . .
Title
30-31/

If Graduate Student

(a) 1 ☐ At cooperating institution
32/ **Or**
2 ☐ Elsewhere . . . .
Name of Institution

(b) Date of matriculation

. . . .
Month 33-34/ *Year* 35-36/

5. (a) At the time you submitted your proposal, what was your **major** field or specialty?

Please check only one

Education

37/ 1 ☐ Administration
2 ☐ Curriculum
3 ☐ Research and Statistics
4 ☐ Teacher Training
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

Psychology

38/ 1 ☐ Developmental
2 ☐ Guidance and Counseling
3 ☐ Learning
4 ☐ Personality
5 ☐ Testing and Measurement
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

Social Science

39/ 1 ☐ History
2 ☐ Political Science
3 ☐ Sociology
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

x ☐ **Other field or specialty** *(Please specify)* . . . .

(b) Within your major field, were you specializing in one or more of the sub-areas listed below?

Check all that apply

40/ 1 ☐ Pre-school
2 ☐ Elementary
3 ☐ Secondary
4 ☐ College
5 ☐ Graduate
6 ☐ Adolescent
7 ☐ Adult
8 ☐ Vocational
9 ☐ Distributive
0 ☐ None
x ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

6. In what activities were you engaged when you submitted the proposal to USOE?

Please give your best estimate of the time you spent on each activity

	Per cent of time	*Activity*
41-42/	. . . . . .	Curriculum or educational program development
43-44/	. . . . . .	Research (other than for a course or degree requirement)
45-46/	. . . . . .	Services (school surveys, consultation, test administration or scoring, workshops, etc.)
47-48/	. . . . . .	Working toward an advanced degree: 49/ 1 ☐ M.A. 2 ☐ Ed.D. 3 ☐ Ph.D.
50-51/	. . . . . .	Teaching
52-53/	. . . . . .	Other *(Please specify*, e.g., administration) . . . .
	100%	

DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSAL

7. How did you first learn of the USOE Regional Research Program?

54/ 1 ☐ Oral presentation of the program by a USOE official
2 ☐ Personal contact with a USOE official
3 ☐ Through CORD, the program for developing research capacities at institutions of higher education
4 ☐ From a colleague, supervisor, dean, or research coordinator
0 ☐ Cannot recall
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

8. How did you plan to conduct the research described in the proposal?

Check one

55/ 1 ☐ As a staff member of a research organization (e.g., a Center, Bureau, Institute, or similar unit that conducts more than one study at a time)

. . . .
Name of research unit *Supporting institution* *City and State*

2 ☐ As a non-staff member of a research organization who would use the facilities or equipment (e.g., computer, library, clerical staff)

. . . .
Name of research unit *Supporting institution* *City and State*

3 ☐ As an independent study director not connected with a research organization

9. Was this project the first one you directed or co-directed?

56/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

10. Did you intend the proposed research for a doctoral dissertation?

57/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes, *please check one:* 58/ 2 ☐ Ed.D. 3 ☐ Ph.D.

11. Thinking back, would you say you had some well-defined research plans before you thought of applying to the Regional Research Program?

59/ 1 ☐ Yes, research plans were well-defined before applying to the program.
2 ☐ No, had general idea for research but did not think out details until after deciding to apply to USOE.
3 ☐ No, did not develop the ideas for this research until I knew about the program.

12. Had you previously submitted a similar proposal to a funding agency?

60/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: (a) What was the agency? 61-63/

(b) Did you have to rewrite the proposal before submitting it to the Regional Research Program?

64/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: What modifications did you make?

Check all that apply

65/ 1 ☐ Restricted the scope of the project to stay within the $10,000 ceiling.
2 ☐ Expanded the research plans to take advantage of the $10,000 ceiling.
3 ☐ Focused the project more towards educational problems.
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

13. Was the proposal written to extend research in the **same** specialty in which you had been working, or to begin research in another specialty?

66/ 1 ☐ To extend research in a specialty in which I had been working
2 ☐ To begin research in another specialty

14. (a) When you were preparing the proposal, did you have access to any of the following resources at your institution?
(b) And, which did you use?

	Check all that apply *(a)* *Available Resources*	 *(b)* *Resources Used*
An "information bank" of agencies that fund research	67/ 1 ☐	68/ 1 ☐
Sample application forms of funding agencies	2 ☐	2 ☐
A "resource person" knowledgeable about applying for research funds	3 ☐	3 ☐
Copies of proposals submitted by others	4 ☐	4 ☐
ERIC materials	5 ☐	5 ☐
USOE's "Guidelines for Small Project Research"	6 ☐	6 ☐
USOE's "Winning a Research Bid: Tips on Proposal Writing"	7 ☐	7 ☐

79-80/05
1-6

15. When you submitted this proposal, did you personally know anyone at your institution who was engaged in research that was being funded by an outside agency?

7/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: Was any of this research supported by USOE?

8/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know

16. Does your institution have a policy that requires one or more staff members to critically review a proposal prior to submission?

9/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know

17. Apart from institutional requirements, did you ask anyone to critically read your proposal?

10/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

18. **If anyone critically read your proposal:**

(a) What was his position?

	Check all that apply	
	Within your institution	*Outside your institution*
Research specialist on education	11/ 1 ☐	12/ 1 ☐
Researcher in a behavioral science	2 ☐	2 ☐
Researcher in another discipline	3 ☐	3 ☐
Dissertation advisor	4 ☐	4 ☐
Colleague or peer	5 ☐	5 ☐
Administrator	6 ☐	6 ☐
Research coordinator	7 ☐	7 ☐
Bureau director	8 ☐	8 ☐
Other *(Please specify)*	9 ☐	9 ☐

(b) As a result of these reviews, did you make any of the following changes?

Check all that apply

13/ 1 ☐ Modified the research design
2 ☐ Incorporated more detailed review of previous research
3 ☐ Pointed up the educational significance of the project
4 ☐ Emphasized the potential application of the results
5 ☐ Arranged for more extensive consultation
6 ☐ Included a more complete description of the qualifications of the project personnel
14/ 1 ☐ Described the research facilities more explicitly
2 ☐ Extended the bibliography
3 ☐ Corrected editorial or stylistic weaknesses (e.g., sentence structure, wording, or organization of material)
4 ☐ Revised the budget
5 ☐ Changed the time schedule
0 ☐ None of these changes
9 ☐ Other changes *(Please specify)* . . . .

19. Before you officially submitted the proposal, did you informally discuss it with anyone from the USOE Regional Office or from Washington?

15/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: (a) With whom did you discuss the proposal?

16/ 1 ☐ Regional Director of Educational Research
2 ☐ Staff member from Washington
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

(b) Was the discussion helpful?

17/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

20. As far as preparing the proposal, how would you characterize the USOE's help?

Check one

18/ 1 ☐ They provided all the help I needed.
2 ☐ I wish that they had been more helpful.
3 ☐ I didn't seek any help from USOE.

21. Who paid the clerical costs of preparing the proposal?

Check one

19/ 1 ☐ My department or institution
2 ☐ The costs came out of another research project.
3 ☐ I paid for them personally.
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

22. It is difficult to calculate a precise figure, but what would you guess the clerical costs of your proposal amounted to?

Check one

20/ 1 ☐ Less than $25
2 ☐ $25 - $49
3 ☐ $50 - $99
4 ☐ $100 or more
0 ☐ Cannot guess the cost.

23. Altogether, about how many hours did you actually spend preparing the proposal?

. . . .
Approximate number of hours
21-23/

24. Did you prepare the proposal on your own time or on working time?

24/ 1 ☐ On my own time
2 ☐ On my salaried working time
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

PROCESSING THE PROPOSAL

25. Field readers evaluate each proposal according to four criteria: (1) educational significance; (2) soundness of research design; (3) adequacy of personnel and facilities; and (4) economic efficiency.

(a) Do you think it is appropriate for each proposal to be judged by all of these criteria?

25/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If No: Which one(s) should be eliminated?

26/ 1 ☐ Educational significance
2 ☐ Soundness of research design
3 ☐ Adequacy of personnel and facilities
4 ☐ Economic efficiency

(b) Do you think that any other criteria should be added?

27/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: *Please specify the criteria*

. . . .
28-29/

26. Do you think that a copy of the comments made by field readers should be sent routinely to each applicant?

Please check only one

30/ 1 ☐ Yes, these comments should be sent routinely to every applicant.
2 ☐ Yes, but only to an applicant whose proposal has been rejected.
3 ☐ Yes, but only to an applicant whose proposal has been funded.
4 ☐ No, I don't think the field reader comments should be sent to any applicant.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

27. It is not unnatural for field readers to be influenced by their own professional interests and experiences. For each of the groups listed below, please indicate the kind of reviewer who would be most likely to recognize the distinctive aspects of your proposal.

Check one under each heading

Discipline of reviewers

31/ 1 ☐ Education
2 ☐ Psychology
3 ☐ Sociology
0 ☐ No preference
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

Research interest of reviewers

32/ 1 ☐ Basic research
2 ☐ Applied research
0 ☐ No preference
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

Locale of reviewers

33/ 1 ☐ Major university
2 ☐ Small college
3 ☐ Non-academic setting, such as a state department of education or school system
0 ☐ No preference
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

28. Did you have to wait less time or a longer time than you expected to learn that the proposal was funded?

34/ 1 ☐ Less than I expected.
2 ☐ About what I expected.
3 ☐ Somewhat longer than I expected.
4 ☐ Considerably longer than I expected.

38/
39-40/

29. Before contracting for this research, did the USOE Regional Office require changes in the proposed research?

Check all that apply

72/ 1 ☐ Research design
2 ☐ Data collection instruments
3 ☐ Sample
4 ☐ Planned modes of analysis
5 ☐ Budget
6 ☐ No changes required
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

If changes required: How did you feel about making these changes?

Check one

73/ 1 ☐ They probably strengthened the research.
2 ☐ They were of small consequence.
3 ☐ They probably detracted from the research.

30. Did you begin the research on the proposed starting date?

74/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If No: What problems did the change of starting date create, if any?

Check all problems that apply

75/ 1 ☐ Data collection
2 ☐ Own work schedule
3 ☐ Recruiting staff for the project
4 ☐ Paying project costs
5 ☐ Contracting for equipment
0 ☐ No problems
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

79-80/06

31. Was there anything else especially noteworthy, either positive or negative, about the way the USOE Regional Office processed the proposal?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes: *Please jot down your comments here.*

CONDUCTING THE RESEARCH

1-6/

32. Were you required to obtain clearance from the USOE for any data-collection instruments used in this research?

7/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: (a) How long did it take to get clearance? . . . .
Approximate number of weeks
8-9/

(b) Did the time required for clearance create any problems?

Check one
10/ 1 ☐ It created major obstacles.
2 ☐ It created minor obstacles.
3 ☐ It created no particular obstacles.

(c) Did the USOE clearance require changes in any instruments?

Check all that apply
11/ 1 ☐ Deletion of items
2 ☐ Addition of items
3 ☐ Editing of items
4 ☐ Entire instrument(s) discarded
0 ☐ No changes
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

(d) Was this USOE clearance helpful, or was it a hindrance?

Check one
12/ 1 ☐ Yes, helpful.
2 ☐ No, a hindrance.
3 ☐ It didn't affect the research one way or another.

33. Few researchers can anticipate all the contingencies that arise in a research project. While carrying out this research, did you have to depart from your plans?

Check phases of research requiring departures from plans
13/ 1 ☐ Sample
2 ☐ Amount of time planned for data collection
3 ☐ Modes of analysis
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .
0 ☐ I did not have to depart from my original plans in any appreciable way.

34. Did you encounter problems in obtaining the cooperation of schools or access to subjects?

14/ 1 ☐ Major problems 3 ☐ No problems at all
2 ☐ Minor problems 4 ☐ Not applicable

35. Did you have major difficulty obtaining project help of the following kinds?

Check all that apply
15/ 1 ☐ Clerical help
2 ☐ Research assistants
3 ☐ Cooperation of administrators at your institution
4 ☐ Assistance of consultants (or advisors) when needed
0 ☐ No major difficulty

36. Did you find that so much time was spent collecting the data that less time for analysis was available than originally planned?

16/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 0 ☐ No data collected

37. Did you discover that the project had been underbudgeted in any of the following respects?

Check all that apply

17/ 1 ☐ Personnel
2 ☐ Travel
3 ☐ Supplies and materials
4 ☐ Communications
5 ☐ Services
6 ☐ Equipment
0 ☐ Project was not underbudgeted
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

38. Have you prepared any progress reports for the USOE Regional Office?

18/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 0 ☐ None was required

If Yes: Was the preparation of the progress report much of a problem?

Check one

19/ 1 ☐ No, preparing the progress report was a request easily met.
2 ☐ No, but the time could have been better spent.
3 ☐ Yes, it was a chore to prepare the progress report.
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

39. Have you submitted a final report on the project to the USOE Regional Office?

20/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: (a) Was the final report completed within the grant period?

21/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

(b) Are you currently engaged in research?

Check all that apply

22/ 1 ☐ I am engaged in research on education.
2 ☐ I am engaged in research in another field . . . . *Name of field*
3 ☐ I am not engaged in research.

40. If you have **not** completed this research project, how far have you progressed?

Check one

23/ 1 ☐ I have just received the grant.
2 ☐ About one-fourth of the work has been completed.
3 ☐ I am about half-way through.
4 ☐ I am about three-fourths of the way through.
5 ☐ I have nearly completed the research project.

41. Have you submitted another proposal to the Regional Research Program?

24/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: What is the status of this proposal?

25/ 1 ☐ Funded 2 ☐ Pending 3 ☐ Rejected

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

42. Have any students assisted you on this project?

26/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: As a result of their experience on this project, have any of them decided they will do further work in research?

27/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Don't know

43. Has this project been discussed in any class?

Check all that apply

28/ 1 ☐ Yes, discussed but no data presented.
2 ☐ Yes, discussed and project data presented.
3 ☐ No, not discussed.
0 ☐ Not applicable

44. Has this research led to the addition of new materials to course reading lists?

29/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

45. Are data from this project being used by students for independent study projects? For master's essays? For doctoral dissertations?

Check all that apply

30/ 1 ☐ Independent study projects
2 ☐ Master's essays
3 ☐ Doctoral dissertations
0 ☐ Not applicable

46. Have you encouraged any students to pursue this line of research for independent study projects? For master's essays? For doctoral dissertations?

Check all that apply

31/ 1 ☐ Independent study projects
2 ☐ Master's essays
3 ☐ Doctoral dissertations
0 ☐ Not applicable

47. Since you have undertaken this project, do you find that students are more likely to seek your advice regarding M.A. or doctoral theses?

Check one

32/ 1 ☐ Students are more likely to seek my advice.
2 ☐ There is no noticeable change.
3 ☐ Students are less likely to seek my advice.
0 ☐ Not applicable

48. As a result of this research, have you recommended that any course or curriculum content be modified?

Check all that apply

33/ 1 ☐ I have planned a new course.
2 ☐ I have revised one or more courses.
3 ☐ I have recommended greater emphasis on certain topics, or the addition of new materials.
4 ☐ I have suggested courses in allied disciplines to students.
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .
0 ☐ I have not recommended any changes.

49. Have you been invited to discuss this research with a faculty or student group?

Check all that apply

34/ 1 ☐ Faculty seminar in my department
2 ☐ Interdepartmental faculty seminar
3 ☐ Faculty-student seminar in my department
4 ☐ Interdepartmental faculty-student seminar
5 ☐ Student society
0 ☐ Have not been invited

50. Have you presented (or will you present) a paper based on this project at a state, regional, or national meeting of a professional society?

35/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: *Please check any that apply*

36/ 1 ☐ A state meeting of a professional society
2 ☐ A regional meeting
3 ☐ A national meeting
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

51. Are you writing (or have you written) any manuscripts for publication based on this research?

37/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: What does this include?

Check all that apply

38/ 1 ☐ A journal article **If Published:** . . . . *Name of journal* 39-40/

2 ☐ A book or part of a book . . . . *Title*

9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

If you have no plans to publish, *please state your reason for not doing so.*

41-42/

52 Have you received requests for copies of any written materials based on this project?

Check all that apply

43/ 1 ☐ Proposal
2 ☐ Instruments used in the research
3 ☐ Preliminary report
4 ☐ Project memoranda, etc.
5 ☐ Final report
0 ☐ No requests received
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

53. As a result of this research, have you received any of the following requests or invitations?

Check each item

	Yes (1)	*No* (2)	
44/	☐	☐	Asked by a colleague to critically read a paper.
45/	☐	☐	Asked by a journal to evaluate an article on a related topic.
46/	☐	☐	Asked by a journal to review a book on a related topic.
47/	☐	☐	Approached by a publisher about writing a book on this subject.
48/	☐	☐	Asked by a funding agency to evaluate a proposal in this or a related area of research.
49/	☐	☐	Invited by a funding agency to submit a proposal for further research in the area.

54. Since you have had this research experience, have you been asked to serve as a consultant for any of the following groups?

Check all that apply

50/ 1 ☐ Board of Education
2 ☐ State Department of Education
3 ☐ Federal Government
4 ☐ Commercial producer of learning materials
0 ☐ No requests received
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

55. Was your teaching load reduced to enable you to devote more time to this research?

51/ 0 ☐ Do not teach 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

56. As a result of working on this project, have you improved your skills in any of the following areas?

Check all that apply

52/ 1 ☐ Supervising research assistants
2 ☐ Expository writing
3 ☐ Research budgeting
4 ☐ Developing a research design
5 ☐ Sampling techniques
6 ☐ Survey techniques (interviewing, questionnaire construction)
7 ☐ Locating relevant literature through ERIC
8 ☐ Utilizing general library resources
9 ☐ Computer programming
0 ☐ Modes of analysis, such as:
  53/ 1 ☐ Analysis of covariance
  2 ☐ Analysis of variance
  3 ☐ Correlation or regression analysis
  4 ☐ Descriptive analysis (non-analytical)
  5 ☐ Discriminant function analysis
  6 ☐ Factor or cluster analysis
  7 ☐ Qualitative or historical analysis
  8 ☐ Tests of significance (t tests, chi-square, non-parametric, etc.)
  9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

57. What effect has this research experience had on your interest in doing research on education?

Check one

54/ 1 ☐ It has strengthened my interest in doing research on education.
2 ☐ It has not appreciably affected my interest.
3 ☐ It has diminished my interest in doing research on education.

CAREER ACTIVITIES AND OPINIONS

58. What is your employment status now?

Check as many as apply

55/ 1 ☐ Employed full-time
2 ☐ Employed part-time
3 ☐ Graduate student full-time
4 ☐ Graduate student part-time
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

If not employed, SKIP TO QUESTION 62.

59. Are you still employed by the organization where you were when you submitted the proposal to USOE, or have you moved?

Check one

56/ 1 ☐ Yes, I am still employed at the same organization. **GO TO QUESTION 60.**
2 ☐ No, I have moved.

If Moved: (a) What is your main organizational affiliation now?

. . . .
Name of organization 57-62/ *City and State*

(b) What is your position? . . . .
Title 63-64/

(c) At this new organization, about how much time do you devote to research?

Check one

65/ 1 ☐ More time than at former location
2 ☐ About the same amount of time
3 ☐ Less time than at former location
0 ☐ None

(d) Did this move to another organization represent a promotion?

66/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 3 ☐ Not sure

If Yes: Do you attribute the promotion to your research efforts?

67/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ Partly 3 ☐ No 4 ☐ Don't know

(e) Did you rec[illegible] a salary increase when you made this move?

68/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: Do you attribute the increase to your research?

69/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ Partly 3 ☐ No 4 ☐ Don't know

GO TO QUESTION 62.

60. Have you been promoted since you started this research project?

70/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: Do you attribute the promotion to your research efforts?

71/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ Partly 3 ☐ No 4 ☐ Don't know

61. Have you received a salary increase?

72/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: Do you attribute the increase to your research efforts?

73/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ Partly 3 ☐ No 4 ☐ Don't know

79-80/07
1-6

62. At present, how do you divide your professional time?

Please give your best estimate of the percentage of time you spend on each activity.

	Per cent of time	*Activity*
7-8/	. . . . . .	Curriculum or educational program development
9-10/	. . . . . .	Research (other than for a course or degree requirement)
11-12/	. . . . . .	Services (school surveys, consultation, test administration or scoring, workshops, etc.)
13-14/	. . . . . .	Working toward an advanced degree: 15/ 1 ☐ M.A. 2 ☐ Ed.D. 3 ☐ Ph.D.
16-17/	. . . . . .	Teaching
18-19/	. . . . . .	Other *(Please specify*, e.g. Administration) . . . .
	100%	

63. At present, are you an advisor for doctoral dissertations?

20/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: About how many students are you currently advising? . . . .
Number
21-22/

64. **If you have had teaching experience:**

23-24/	. . . . . .	(a) How many years have you taught in elementary or secondary school?
25-26/	. . . . . .	(b) How many years have you taught college undergraduates?
27-28/	. . . . . .	(c) How many years have you taught graduate students?
29-30/	. . . . . .	(d) How many years have you done other types of teaching?

65. Are you a member of any national professional societies?

31/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: Please name the two which are of greatest value to you.

Use identifying words in full

32-33/ . . . .
Name of professional society

34-35/ . . . .
Name of professional society

66. Within the last two years have you attended a meeting of an academic or professional society?

36/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

67. Have you ever been a field reader for the U.S. Office of Education?

37/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If Yes: Approximately how many proposals have you reviewed?

. . . .
Number
38-39/

If No: Do you know anyone who is (or has been) a field reader?

40/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

68. Have you ever been a consultant to the U.S. Office of Education?

41/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

69. How many research studies (articles, monographs, or books) have you published, and what was the date of your first publication?

Number	*Type of publication*
. . . . . . 42-43/	Articles
. . . . . . 44-45/	Monographs
. . . . . . 46-47/	Books

Date of first publication . . . .
Year
48-49/

50/ 0 ☐ No research studies published.

70. Some researchers interested in education seek mainly to achieve recognition from behavioral scientists outside the field of education, while others are primarily concerned with being recognized by researchers within education or by school practitioners. Please check the group whose judgement is **most** important to you personally.

Please check only one

51/ 1 ☐ Researchers within education
2 ☐ Researchers outside education
3 ☐ School practitioners
0 ☐ None of these

71. Through a variety of sources, researchers get an overall impression of funding agencies. Is it your current impression that the Regional Research Program is limited to a few areas of special interest, or does it cover a broad range of interests in education?

52/ 1 ☐ A few areas of special interest
2 ☐ A broad range of interests
0 ☐ I have no impression.

72. Do you think the USOE Regional Research Program tends to be orthodox or venturesome in their support of research?

53/ 1 ☐ Orthodox; more likely to support established lines of research.
2 ☐ Venturesome; willing to take risks in developing new lines of research on education.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

73. As far as departures from the original proposal are concerned, is it your opinion that the Regional Research Program tends to be fairly strict or somewhat permissive?

54/ 1 ☐ Fairly strict in expecting researchers to adhere closely to plans stated in proposals.
2 ☐ Fairly permissive in allowing researchers to depart from their original plans.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

74. In comparing the procedures that an applicant must follow when submitting a proposal to the Regional Research Program with those required by other agencies, would you say the Regional Research Program involves more, about the same, or somewhat less "red tape"?

55/ 1 ☐ More "red tape" than most other funding agencies
2 ☐ About the same amount of "red tape"
3 ☐ Somewhat less "red tape"
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

75. Some researchers view the regulation requiring clearance of educational data-gathering instruments as a good idea, whereas others regard it as an unwarranted intrusion by USOE. What is your opinion, if any?

56/ 1 ☐ It is a good idea.
2 ☐ It is an unwarranted intrusion by USOE.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

76. Have you ever submitted any data-gathering instruments to USOE for clearance?

57/ 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

77. As you may know, it is standard practice for the USOE to withhold a fixed percentage of a grant until the final report has been approved. Do you think this is a good idea?

58/ 1 ☐ I agree with this practice.
2 ☐ I disagree with it.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

78. The USOE Regional Research Program encourages significant small scale educational research projects. What do you think the ceiling on funds should be for small project research?

$ . . . .
Appropriate ceiling
59-61/

Please comment on your preference.

62-63/

79. Finally, if you were to get a research grant for $10,000 or less, do you have any preference about the source of the grant?

Check one

64/ 1 ☐ I prefer a government agency. *(Specify a particular one, if you wish.)*

. . . .

2 ☐ I prefer a private foundation. *(Specify, if you wish.)*

. . . .

9 ☐ Other source *(Please specify)*

. . . .

0 ☐ I have no preference about the source of the grant.

If you do have a preference: Which of the following considerations influenced your choice?

Check any that apply

65/ 1 ☐ Absence of "red tape" in preparing the proposal
2 ☐ Promptness of notification regarding support
3 ☐ Method of proposal review
4 ☐ Freedom to modify research plans
5 ☐ Amount of project monitoring by funding agency
6 ☐ Little likelihood of budgetary cutback
7 ☐ Latitude in preparation of final report
8 ☐ Copyright privileges
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

79-80/08

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL BACKGROUND

1-6

80. Please list the colleges or universities where you have earned a degree.

Institution	State	Name of Degree	Year of Degree	Major Field		Was degree in Education?	
						Yes (1)	No (2)
7-12/	. . . .	. . . . 13/	. . . . 14-15/	. . . . 16-17/	18/	☐	☐
19-24/	. . . .	. . . . 25/	. . . . 26-27/	. . . . 28-29/	30/	☐	☐
31-36/	. . . .	. . . . 37/	. . . . 38-39/	. . . . 40-41/	42/	☐	☐

81. Who is (was) the major advisor on your dissertation? . . . .
Name of Advisor
43-44/

45/ 0 ☐ I have not written a dissertation.

82. Sex: 46/ 1 ☐ Male 2 ☐ Female

83. Number of dependents, other than yourself . . . .
Number
47-48/

84. Year of birth . . . .
49-50/

85. (a) Where did you live most of the time while you were growing up?

51-52/ . . . . *City* . . . . *State* . . . . *Country, if not U.S.A.*

(b) Where do you live now?

53-54/ . . . . *City* . . . . *State*

(c) How would you characterize where you grew up, and where you live now?

	Mark one in each column			
		Lived		*Now live*
A farm	55/	1 ☐	56/	1 ☐
A small town		2 ☐		2 ☐
A moderate size town or city		3 ☐		3 ☐
A suburb of a large city		4 ☐		4 ☐
A large city		5 ☐		5 ☐

86. What is the highest level of formal education reached by your spouse? Your father? Your mother?

Mark one in each column

		Spouse		*Father*		*Mother*
No spouse	57/	0 ☐	58/		59/	
8th grade or less		1 ☐		1 ☐		1 ☐
Some high school		2 ☐		2 ☐		2 ☐
Completed high school		3 ☐		3 ☐		3 ☐
Some college		4 ☐		4 ☐		4 ☐
Graduated from college		5 ☐		5 ☐		5 ☐
Some graduate school		6 ☐		6 ☐		6 ☐
First professional degree		7 ☐		7 ☐		7 ☐
Master's Degree		8 ☐		8 ☐		8 ☐
Ph.D. or Ed.D.		9 ☐		9 ☐		9 ☐

87. Were your parents ever employed in educational work?

Father	60/	1 ☐ Yes	2 ☐ No
Mother	61/	1 ☐ Yes	2 ☐ No

88. *(Optional)* In what religion were you raised? What is your present religion?

Mark one in each column

		Religion in which raised		*Present religion*
Catholic	62/	1 ☐	63/	1 ☐
Jewish		2 ☐		2 ☐
Protestant		3 ☐		3 ☐
None		0 ☐		0 ☐
Other . . . . *(Please specify)*		9 ☐		9 ☐

89. Race: 64/ 1 ☐ Caucasian 2 ☐ Negro 9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* . . . .

90. In which of the following categories was your total income for 1968? What do you expect it to be for 1969?

	1968		1969
65/ 1	☐ Under $5,000	66/ 1	☐ Under $5,000
2	☐ $5,000 - $7,499	2	☐ $5,000 - $7,499
3	☐ $7,500 - $9,999	3	☐ $7,500 - $9,999
4	☐ $10,000 - $14,999	4	☐ $10,000 - $14,999
5	☐ $15,000 - $19,999	5	☐ $15,000 - $19,999
6	☐ $20,000 - $24,999	6	☐ $20,000 - $24,999
7	☐ $25,000 - $29,999	7	☐ $25,000 - $29,999
8	☐ $30,000 or more	8	☐ $30,000 or more

79-80/09

We would appreciate having a copy of any paper you may have given at a convention or reprints of any research reports you may have written. Thank you for completing the questionnaire, and we wish you the best of luck in your future research.

NO ENVELOPE OR POSTAGE NECESSARY FOR RETURNING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE STAPLE OR TAPE THE OPEN EDGE AND MAIL.

QUESTIONNAIRE

FOR FIELD READERS

Supported by

United States Office of Education

Bureau of Applied Social Research
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
605 West 115th Street
New York, New York 10025

1. All information is confidential. The results will be published only in statistical form.
2. Most questions can be answered by a check-mark. If you wish to explain your responses, jot your comments in the margin.
3. When completed, please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

CAREER ACTIVITIES AND OPINIONS

1-6/ ________ (FR number)

1. Have you been engaged in research during any of the years listed below?

PLEASE CHECK FOR EACH YEAR

Year		*Engaged in research on education* (1)	*Engaged in research other than on education* (2)	*Not engaged in research* (0)
1969	7/	☐	☐	☐
1968	8/	☐	☐	☐
1967	9/	☐	☐	☐
1966	10/	☐	☐	☐
1965	11/	☐	☐	☐
1964	12/	☐	☐	☐

2. Have you ever submitted any proposals to the U.S. Office of Education's Regional Research Program?

13/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

IF YES: (a) How many have you submitted? ...... *Number* 14/15

(b) What have the outcomes been?

	Number	
Pending	......	16/17
Funded	......	18/19
Not funded	......	20/21

3. Have you ever received a research grant from any of these sources?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

22/ y
1 ☐ U.S. Office of Education
2 ☐ Another federal agency
3 ☐ State or municipal government
4 ☐ Private foundation
5 ☐ Commercial organization
6 ☐ Your own institution
9 ☐ Other (*Please specify*) ______________________

0 ☐ No research grant received

4. (a) What is your major field or specialty?

PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE

EDUCATION

23/ 1 ☐ Administration
2 ☐ Curriculum
y 3 ☐ Research and Statistics
4 ☐ Teacher Training
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*____________________

PSYCHOLOGY

24/ 1 ☐ Developmental
2 ☐ Guidance and Counseling
y 3 ☐ Learning
4 ☐ Personality
5 ☐ Testing and Measurement
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*____________________

SOCIAL SCIENCE

25/ 1 ☐ History
2 ☐ Political Science
y 3 ☐ Sociology
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*____________________

26/ ☐ Other Field or Specialty *(Please specify)*__________
y

(b) Within your major field, do you specialize in any of the sub-areas listed below?

PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

27/ 1 ☐ Pre-school
2 ☐ Elementary
y 3 ☐ Secondary
4 ☐ College
5 ☐ Graduate
6 ☐ Adolescent
7 ☐ Adult
8 ☐ Vocational
9 ☐ Distributive
X ☐ Other *(Please specify)*____________________

0 ☐ None

5. At present, how do you divide your professional time?

PLEASE GIVE YOUR BEST ESTIMATE OF THE TIME YOU SPEND ON EACH ACTIVITY

	Per cent of time	*Activity*
28-29/	.....	Curriculum or educational program development
30-31/	.....	Research
32-33/	.....	Services (school surveys; consultation; test administration; workshops)
34-35/	.....	Teaching
36-37/	.....	Other *(Please specify*, e.g., administration*)*
	100%	______________________________

6. Are you an advisor for doctoral dissertations? 38/ y 1[ ] Yes 2[ ] No

IF YES: (a) How many dissertations are you currently supervising?

______ *Number* 39-40/

(b) Are any of these dissertations supported by the USOE Regional Research Program?

41/ x 1 [ ] Yes 2 [ ] No 3 [ ] Don't know y

7. Are you now under contract to the U.S. Office of Education as a field reader?

42/ y 1 [ ] Yes 2 [ ] No

8. In all, how many years have you been a field reader for the U.S. Office of Education?

______ *Number of Years* 43-44/

9. Altogether, how many USOE proposals have you reviewed? ______ *Number* 45-46/

10. Of these proposals, about how many were submitted to the Regional Research Program?

______ *Number* 47-48/

11. Thinking back, would you say that the quality of the proposals you have reviewed for the Regional Research Program has changed in the following respects:

(a) The criterion *educational significance* is more, or less, frequently satisfied now than in the past?

49/ y 1 ☐ More frequently satisfied
2 ☐ No observable change
3 ☐ Less frequently satisfied
0 ☐ I have no impression.

(b) The criterion *soundness of research design* is more, or less, frequently satisfied now than in the past?

50/ y 1 ☐ More frequently satisfied
2 ☐ No observable change
3 ☐ Less frequently satisfied
0 ☐ I have no impression.

12. Do you think that a copy of the comments made by field readers should be sent routinely to each applicant?

PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE

51/ y 1 ☐ Yes, these comments should be sent routinely to all applicants.
2 ☐ Comments should be sent only to applicants who request them.
3 ☐ Comments should be sent only to applicants whose proposals have been rejected.
4 ☐ Comments should be sent only to applicants whose proposals have been funded.
5 ☐ No, I don't think field reader comments should be sent to any applicants.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

13. Should field readers be informed of the outcomes of the proposals they evaluate?

52/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 0 ☐ No opinion

14. Should the final report be reviewed by a field reader who recommended the project for funding?

53/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 0 ☐ No opinion

15. The present USOE Evaluation Form asks the reviewer to:

(a) Provide an overall evaluation of the proposal;
(b) Discuss the proposal as it relates to the reviewer's area of specialization; and
(c) State to what extent the proposal satisfies four criteria:
    (1) educational significance
    (2) soundness of research design
    (3) adequacy of personnel and facilities
    (4) economic efficiency.

Would you recommend any of the following changes in the Evaluation Form?

CHECK ALL CHANGES YOU RECOMMEND

		For Regional Research Program proposals		*For all USOE proposals*
Eliminate (b) above	54/	1 [ ]	56/	1 [ ]
Provide a rating scale for each of the four criteria (e.g., educational significance).	0	2 [ ]	0	2 [ ]
Standardize the form by using checklists instead of essay-type answers.		3 [ ]		3 [ ]
Separate the criterion "adequacy of personnel and facilities" into two criteria, "adequacy of personnel" and "adequacy of facilities."		4 [ ]		4 [ ]
Perforate the evaluation form so that comments recorded below the perforation could be sent to the applicant, while those above would be for USOE exclusively.		5 [ ]		5 [ ]
Eliminate one or more of the criteria listed in (c) above:				
(1) educational significance		6 [ ]		6 [ ]
(2) soundness of research design		7 [ ]		7 [ ]
(3) adequacy of personnel and facilities		8 [ ]		8 [ ]
(4) economic efficiency		9 [ ]		9 [ ]
Add other criteria to (c) above:				
(1) significance beyond education	55/	1 [ ]	57/	1 [ ]
(2) creativity of researcher	0	2 [ ]	0	2 [ ]
(3) suitability for replication		3 [ ]		3 [ ]
(4) other *(Please specify)* ________________ ________________		9 [ ]		9 [ ]

20. In addition to being a field reader, have you ever been a consultant to USOE?

72/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 0 ☐ Cannot recall

79-80/11

1-6/

21. Have you ever reviewed proposals for a granting agency other than USOE?

7/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 0 ☐ Cannot recall

IF YES: (a) For what type of agency?

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

8/ 1 ☐ Another federal agency
2 ☐ State or municipal government
x 3 ☐ Private foundation
4 ☐ Professional association
y 5 ☐ Educational consortium
6 ☐ Your own institution
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)* ______________________

(b) Do you think that the quality of proposals submitted to USOE is better, about the same, or not as good as other proposals you have reviewed?

9/ 1 ☐ Proposals submitted to USOE are better
x 2 ☐ About the same
3 ☐ Not as good as others
y 0 ☐ Not comparable

22. Have you ever been an editorial consultant for a scientific journal?

10/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No 0 ☐ Cannot recall

23. Are you a member of any national professional societies?

11/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

IF YES: *PLEASE NAME THE TWO WHICH ARE OF GREATEST VALUE TO YOU.*
Use identifying words in full.

12-14/ 1. ______________________________

15-17/ 2. ______________________________

24. At present, are you an officer of an academic or professional society?

18/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

IF YES: ______________________________
Name of society in full 19-21/

25. Within the last two years have you attended a meeting of an academic or professional society?

22/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

26. How many *research studies* (articles, monographs, or books) have you published, and what was the date of your first publication?

	Number	*Type of Publication*
23-24/	......	Articles
25-26/	......	Monographs
27-28/	......	Books
29-30/	...... *Year*	Date of first publication
31/ x	0 ☐	No research studies published

27. Would you describe your research interest as mainly basic or applied?

32/ y
1 ☐ Basic
2 ☐ Applied
9 ☐ Other *(Please specify)*______________________________

28. Some researchers interested in education seek mainly to achieve recognition from behavioral scientists outside the field of education, while others are primarily concerned with being recognized by researchers within education or by school practitioners. Please check the group whose judgment is most important to you personally.

PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE

33/ y
1 ☐ Researchers within education
2 ☐ Researchers outside education
3 ☐ School practitioners
0 ☐ None of these

29. Through a variety of sources, researchers get an overall impression of funding agencies. Is it your current impression that the Regional Research Program is limited to a few areas of special interest, or does it cover a broad range of interests in education?

34/ y 1 ☐ A few areas of special interest
2 ☐ A broad range of interests
0 ☐ I have no impression.

30. Do you think that the USOE Regional Research Program tends to be orthodox or venturesome in its support of research?

35/ y 1 ☐ Orthodox; more likely to support established lines of research.
2 ☐ Venturesome; willing to take risks in developing new lines of research on education.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

31. As far as departures from the original proposal are concerned, is it your opinion that the Regional Research Program tends to be fairly strict or somewhat permissive?

36/ y 1 ☐ Fairly strict in expecting researchers to adhere closely to plans stated in proposals.
2 ☐ Fairly permissive in allowing researchers to depart from their original plans.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

32. Do you think that the Regional Research Program should encourage the researcher to investigate certain definite areas (e.g., reading), or should it encourage him to develop his own area of interest within the field of education?

37/ y 1 ☐ Encourage the researcher to investigate certain definite areas.
2 ☐ Encourage the researcher to develop his own interest.
3 ☐ I have no opinion.

33. In comparing procedures that an applicant must follow when submitting a proposal to the Regional Research Program with those required by other agencies, would you say that the Regional Research Program involves more, about the same, or somewhat less "red tape"?

38/ y 1 ☐ More "red tape" than most other funding agencies
2 ☐ About the same amount of "red tape"
3 ☐ Somewhat less "red tape"
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

34. Some researchers view the regulation requiring clearance of educational data-gathering instruments as a good idea, whereas others regard it as an unwarranted intrusion by USOE. What is your opinion, if any?

39/ y 1 ☐ It is a good idea.
2 ☐ It is an unwarranted intrusion by USOE.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

35. Have you ever submitted any data-gathering instruments to USOE for clearance?

40/ y 1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

36. As you may know, it is standard practice for the USOE to withhold a fixed percentage of a grant until the final report has been approved. Do you think this is a good idea?

41/ y 1 ☐ I agree with this practice.
2 ☐ I disagree with the practice.
0 ☐ I have no opinion.

37. A stated goal of the Regional Research Program is:

> "To encourage small colleges to undertake research programs so that students may benefit from having professors who are engaged in educational research activities."

Do you think that this goal should be emphasized more, about the same, or less than it is now?

42/ y 1 ☐ More
2 ☐ About the same
3 ☐ Less
0 ☐ I have no opinion

38. The present ceiling on funds for proposals submitted to the Regional Research Program is $10,000. What do you think the ceiling on funds should be?

$____________________
43-45/

PLEASE COMMENT ON YOUR PREFERENCE

46-47/

yy

39. Listed below are some possible advantages of being a field reader for the Regional Research Program. Indicate those that apply to you personally.

CHECK ALL THAT APPLY

48/ y
1 [ ] Acquisition of 'intelligence' about USOE granting practices
2 [ ] Contact with educational researchers from other institutions
3 [ ] Contact with USOE officials
4 [ ] Exposure to new research ideas
5 [ ] Intellectual stimulation
6 [ ] Opportunity to contribute ideas to young researchers
7 [ ] Opportunity to influence research on education
8 [ ] Professional prestige
9 [ ] Other *(Please specify)*______________________________

____

Please use this space for additional comments, either positive or negative, about the Regional Research Program--for example, goals of the Program, method of evaluating proposals, selection of field readers, remuneration to field readers, or any other aspect of the Program you wish to discuss.

49-51/

yyy

79-80/12

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Copy No._____

CODEBOOK

STUDY OF U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
REGIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
May, 1970

CONTENTS

Applicant Questionnaire

Field Reader Questionnaire

Proposal Content (Respondent Section)

Proposal Content (Non-Respondent Section)

Proposal Evaluation

Non-Respondent Background

Institutions

APPENDICES:

A. Applicant Position

B. Professional Societies

C. State Code

D. Major Field

E. Specialties List

INTRODUCTION

This codebook is based on data obtained from four sources:

Applicant Questionnaire
Field Reader Questionnaire
Applicant Proposal
Proposal Evaluation.

Applicant Questionnaire. In July, 1969, two versions of this questionnaire were mailed to all applicants submitting proposals to the USOE Small-Project Grants Program during Fiscal Year 1968. One was sent to applicants who were funded (N=281), and the other to those who were not funded (N=561). Six hundred sixty-five questionnaires were returned and processed (89 per cent of the qeustionnaires sent to funded applicants and 73 per cent of those sent to not funded applicants). Section I of the codebook presents the data from these questionnaires.

Field Reader Questionnaire. In March, 1970, a questionnaire was mailed to 498 field readers, the evaluators under contract to USOE, who reviewed the proposals submitted during Fiscal Year 1968. Four hundred twenty-three questionnaires were returned and processed (85 per cent). Section II presents the data from these questionnaires.

Applicant Proposal. Factual material was abstracted from the proposals submitted by each applicant in the questionnaire sample. Data from the 665 proposals for the applicants completing the questionnaire are presented in Section III, and those from the 177 proposals for the applicants not responding to the questionnaire are presented in Section IV.

The background data for the 177 non-respondents, appearing in Section VI of the codebook, was extracted from their proposals.

Proposal Evaluation. The field reader recommendations and ratings on the major criteria for evaluating each proposal are presented in Section V.

STANDARD IDENTIFICATION

I. Applicant Questionnaire

A. Fiscal Year (July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968)	Column 1/	8	Respondent
B. USOE Regional Office	Column 2/	1	Boston
		2	New York
		3	Charlottesville
		4	Atlanta
		5	Chicago
		6	Kansas City
		7	Dallas
		8	Denver
		9	San Francisco
C. Applicant Number	Columns 3-5/		
D. Disposition	Column 6/	1	Funded
		2	Not funded

II. Field Reader Questionnaire

A. Area Location served by USOE Regional Office	Columns 1-2/	01	Boston
		02	New York
		03	Charlottesville
		04	Atlanta
		05	Chicago
		06	Kansas City
		07	Dallas
		08	Denver
		09	San Francisco
		10	Unassigned - Canada
B. Accession Number*	Columns 3-6/		

---

*Source: Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Field Reader catalogs. The two leading zeros of each number have been omitted.

III. Proposal

Identifications apply to:

1. Proposal Content (Respondent Section)
2. Proposal Content (Non-Respondent Section)
3. Proposal Evaluation
4. Non-Respondent Background

A. Case Type	Column 1/		
		5	Non-respondent
		8	Respondent
B. USOE Regional Office (ERIC Code)	Column 2/		
		A	Boston
		B	New York
		C	Charlottesville
		D	Atlanta
		E	Chicago
		F	Kansas City
		G	Dallas
		H	Denver
		I	San Francisco
C. Applicant Number	Columns 3-5/		
D. Disposition	Column 6/		
		1	Funded
		2	Not funded

IV. Institutions

A. State (Listing in Appendix C)	Columns 1-2/
B. USOE Number (Explicit identification in Nash college file -- BASR #B1050)	Columns 3-6/

V. Decks

A. Source of Data — Column 79/

0	Applicant questionnaire
1	Field Reader questionnaire
2	Proposal
	a. Content (Respondent Section)
	b. Content (Non-Respondent Section)
	c. Non-Respondent Background
3	Evaluation
4	Institution

B. Sequence Number — Column 80/

1-9	Applicant questionnaire
1-4	Field Reader questionnaire
2-5	Proposal content
1	Non-Respondent background
1-n	Evaluation (n varies from one to twelve)
1	Institution

NOTES

Multiple-Punched Columns. Originally, many columns were multiple-punched. For computer processing, the punches have been transferred to separate columns. Each numeric punch, one through nine, has been converted to a one (1) in the new column. A zero punch (0) in the new column indicates that the response category was not checked by the respondent. Each zero (0), X (11 punch), or Y (12 punch) has been transferred as a one (1), but the absence of the punch has not been assigned a value; the column has been left blank -- a reject (R). The frequencies for the zeros and rejects in the new columns do not appear in the codebook.

Column Totals. Where column totals appear in the codebook, the original column contained multiple punches.

ERRATA

I. Applicant Questionnaire

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
Item 2.						
II	7/	1	USOE	60	92	152
	8/	1	Another government agency	51	104	155
Item 6.						
V	49/	X	DNA: Should read			
		R	DNA:			
Item 19. IF YES: (a) With whom did you discuss the proposal?						
VI	16/	9	Other (e.g., regional intern)	-	11	11
Item 48. (45)						
IV	13/	1	I have not recommended any changes	107	98	205
Item 49. (46)						
IV	20/	1	Interdepartmental faculty-student seminar	23	32	55
Item 60. (57)						
VII	70/	1	Yes	47	89	136
		X	DNA: Moved to another organization	72	119	191
Item 39. (34)						
VII	76/	3	Not engaged in research	35	-	35
		X	DNA: RRP project not completed	130	-	130
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

V. Proposal Evaluation

			Field Reader	In-house
Item 12.	By In-house reviewer:			
80/	1 One 7 One	Should read		424

APPLICANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Position on project

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	19/	1	Project Director	152	194	346
		2	Principal Investigator	83	158	241
		3	Consultant	--	3	3
		4	Research Assistant	3	1	4
		5	Co-director	8	31	39
		6	Assistant Director	4	3	7
		7	Initiator	--	7	7
		8	Co-initiator	1	--	1
		9	Research Associate	--	1	1
		0	Contract Officer	--	2	2
		Y	No answer	--	14	14

1. In the last five years have you been engaged in any research projects?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
	1968:					
V	7/	1	Education	138	228	366
		2	Another field	20	44	64
		3	Education and another field	33	47	80
		0	Not engaged in research	60	93	153
		Y	No activity specified	--	2	2
	1967:					
V	8/	1	Education	114	214	328
		2	Another field	29	50	79
		3	Education and another field	32	40	72
		0	Not engaged in research	76	108	184
		Y	No activity specified	--	2	2
	1966:					
V	9/	1	Education	94	170	264
		2	Another field	41	59	100
		3	Education and another field	21	35	56
		0	Not engaged in research	95	148	243
		Y	No activity specified	--	2	2
	1965:					
V	10/	1	Education	70	130	200
		2	Another field	43	67	110
		3	Education and another field	16	20	36
		0	Not engaged in research	122	195	317
		Y	No activity specified	--	2	2

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
	1964:					
V	11/	1	Education	59	90	149
		2	Another field	39	65	104
		3	Education and another field	19	17	36
		0	Not engaged in research	134	240	374
		Y	No activity specified	-	2	2

2. Have you ever received a research grant from any of the following sources?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
II	7/	1	USOE	60	93	153
	8/	1	Another government agency	51	105	156
	9/	1	Private foundation	41	65	106
	10/	1	Employing institution	86	182	268
	11/	1	Commercial organization (e.g.,IBM)	10	9	19
	12/	1	Educational organization (e.g., Phi Delta Kappa, AAUW)	8	11	19
	13/	1	No grant received	108	141	249
	14/	1	No answer	3	6	9
				(367)	(612)	(979)

3. What cooperating institution was listed on the title page of your proposal?

V 13-18/ See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID. First two digits of Nash college file identify state in which institution located. See Appendix C for listing of states.

Type of institution:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	22/	1	College or university	222	338	560
		2	State Department of Education	4	5	9
		3	School system	18	48	66
		4	Private agency	7	17	24
		9	Individual or other (e.g., educational association)	-	6	6

(a) If College or University:

Subdivision:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	24/	1	Education	100	164	264
		3	Research institute or bureau	12	12	24
		5	Both education and research institute	8	6	14

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
3(a)	(Continued)					
	Liberal Arts Subdivision:					
V	23/	1	Psychology	26	20	46
		2	Sociology	8	12	20
		3	Other social science	16	20	36
		4	Math, physical or biological science	9	21	30
		5	English and language arts	12	25	37
		6	Music and art	4	14	18
		7	Liberal arts - NEC	4	--	4
		Y	Department not specified	2	3	5
	Other Subdivision:					
V	21/	3	Professional school	2	2	4
		4	Engineering; applied science	7	4	11
		5	Library and languages	5	1	6
		6	Music and art	3	7	10
		7	Administrative officer	12	27	39
		8	Vocational and applied arts	6	5	11
		9	Audio-visual	1	1	2
		0	Physical education	5	7	12
	24/	Y	Subdivision not specified	--	1	1
		X	DNA: Not in higher education	29	75	104
				(271)	(427)	(698)
(b)	Enrollment					
V	25/	1	Undergraduate	28	57	85
		2	Graduate	47	62	109
		3	Joint undergraduate/graduate	111	179	290
		Y	Enrollment not specified	20	19	39
		X	DNA: Not in higher education	45	97	142

4. At the time you submitted this proposal, what was your employment status?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	26/	1	Employed full-time	164	275	439
		2	Employed part-time	5	12	17
		3	Graduate student full-time	30	30	60
		4	Graduate student part-time	4	5	9
		5	Employed f-t; student f-t	1	3	4
		6	Employed f-t; student p-t	29	53	82
		7	Employed p-t; student f-t	5	12	17
		8	Employed p-t; student p-t	7	22	29
	20/	9	Other (e.g., emeritus, post-doctoral fellow)	6	2	8

(a) IF EMPLOYED:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	27/	1	Cooperating institution	196	340	536
		2	Elsewhere	20	41	61
		Y	No answer	-	1	1
		X	DNA: Not employed	35	32	67

(b) Beginning date of employment:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	28-29/	1968	7	7	14
		1967	50	51	101
		1966	36	74	110
		1965	21	50	71
		1964	24	19	43
		1962-63	22	31	53
		1958-61	29	41	70
		1950-57	13	47	60
		Prior to 1950 (1929-1949)	10	21	31
		YY No answer	4	41	45
		XX DNA: Not employed	35	32	67

(c) Position: (See Appendix A for refined classification of position in V 30-31/ and second named position in V 69-70/)

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	30/	0	Research Director	16	28	44
		1	Faculty	153	239	392

	(F)	(NF)
Prof.	43	66
Assoc.	46	67
Ass't.	54	89
Other	10	17

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
		2	Student Assistant or Fellow	5	17	22
		3	Administrative Officer	11	30	41
		4	Program Director	10	22	32
		5	Counselor or Consultant	7	17	24
		7	Teacher	11	22	33
		8	School Administrator	2	6	8
		Y	No answer	1	1	2
		X	DNA: Not employed	35	32	67

(a) IF GRADUATE STUDENT:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	32/	1	Cooperating institution	51	86	137
		2	Elsewhere	25	38	63
		Y	No answer	-	1	1
		X	DNA: Not student	175	289	464

(b) Year of matriculation: (Month recorded in V 33-34/)

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	35-36/	1967-68	9	10	19
		1966	10	20	30
		1965	17	8	25
		1964	7	11	18
		1960-63	5	7	12
		Prior to 1960 (1951-59)	2	7	9
		YY No answer	26	62	88
		XX DNA: Not student	175	289	464

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
5(a)			At the time you submitted your proposal, what was your major field or specialty?			
			Education:			
V	37/	1	Administration	31	47	78
		2	Curriculum	15	40	55
		3	Research and statistics	11	23	34
		4	Teacher training	57	85	142
		5	Instructional technology	5	6	11
		6	Special education (e.g., adult, business)	7	21	28
		7	Teacher - below college level	1	12	13
			Psychology:			
V	38/	1	Developmental	11	9	20
		2	Guidance and counseling	19	29	48
		3	Learning	13	10	23
		4	Personality	4	5	9
		5	Testing and measurement	3	4	7
		6	Educational	7	7	14
		7	Clinical	3	4	7
		9	Other (e.g., social, experimental)	5	10	15
			Social Science:			
V	39/	1	History	3	9	12
		2	Political science	5	5	10
		3	Sociology	10	15	25
		9	Other (e.g., anthropology, economics)	8	19	27
			Other field or specialty:			
V	39/	4	Math; physical, biological sciences	12	22	34
		5	English and language arts	15	18	33
		6	Music and art	4	11	15
		X	Professions (e.g., medicine, nursing, law)	2	3	5

5(b) Within your major field, were you specializing in one or more of the sub-areas listed below?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX	67/	1	Pre-school	17	28	45
	68/	1	Elementary	52	101	153
	69/	1	Secondary	62	136	198
	70/	1	College	81	153	234
	71/	1	Graduate	33	78	111
	72/	1	Adolescent	9	32	41
	73/	1	Adult	16	40	56
	74/	1	Vocational	20	44	64
	75/	1	None	75	77	152
	76/	1	No answer	14	22	36
				(379)	(711)	(1090)

6. In what activities were you engaged when you submitted the proposal to USOE?

Per cent time Curriculum or Program Development:

V	41-42/	01-20		27	80	107
		21-40		15	30	45
		41-60		9	20	29
		61-80		5	6	11
		81-100		1	5	6
		RR	No time this area	190	261	451
		YY	No answer	3	12	15
		XX	Retired	1	--	1

Per cent time Research:

V	43-44/	01-20		45	93	138
		21-40		45	63	108
		41-60		26	30	56
		61-80		3	16	19
		81-100		8	8	16
		RR	No time this area	117	192	309
		YY	No answer	6	12	18
		XX	Retired	1	--	1

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
6.	(Continued)				
	Per cent time Services:				
V	45-46/	01-20	32	55	87
		21-40	9	21	30
		41-60	6	5	11
		61-80	3	4	7
		81-100	-	3	3
		RR No time this area	195	314	509
		YY No answer	5	12	17
		XX Retired	1	-	1
	Per cent time Working toward Degree:				
V	47-48/	01-20	15	32	47
		21-40	10	17	27
		41-60	13	27	40
		61-80	8	8	16
		81-100	25	29	54
		RR No time this area	174	289	463
		YY No answer	5	12	17
		XX Retired	1	-	1
	IF WORKING TOWARD DEGREE:				
V	49/	1 Master's	1	8	9
		2 Ed.D.	28	43	71
		3 Ph.D.	47	74	121
		X DNA: Not working toward degree	175	289	464
	Per cent time Teaching:				
V	50-51/	01-20	17	31	48
		21-40	25	57	82
		41-60	60	88	148
		61-80	38	64	102
		81-100	28	42	70
		RR No time this area	75	120	195
		YY No answer	7	12	19
		XX Retired	1	-	1

6. (Continued)

Per cent time Administration and Other:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	52-53/	01-20	31	54	85
		21-40	18	39	57
		41-60	25	32	57
		61-80	7	14	21
		81-100	8	20	28
		RR No time this area	157	243	400
		YY No answer	4	12	16
		XX Retired	1	--	1

7. How did you first learn of the USOE Regional Research Program?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	71/	1	Oral presentation by USOE official or USOE written materials	24	43	67
	72/	1	Personal contact with USOE official	40	36	76
	73/	1	CORD	1	9	10
	74/	1	Colleague; supervisor; dean	156	268	424
	75/	1	Other source (e.g., AERA newsletter)	12	31	43
	76/	1	Cannot recall	26	38	64
	77/	1	No answer	1	6	7
				(260)	(431)	(691)

8. How did you plan to conduct the research described in the proposal?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	55/	1	Staff member in a research unit	43	58	101
		2	Facilitated by a research unit, but not as staff member	11	26	37
		3	Independent of a research unit	192	316	508
		Y	No answer	5	14	19

9. Was this project the first one you directed or co-directed?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	56/	1	Yes	146	218	364
		2	No	99	186	285
		Y	No answer	5	10	15
		X	DNA: Not director or co-director	1	--	1

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
10.	Did you intend the proposed research for a doctoral dissertation?					
V	57/	1	Yes	72	114	186
		2	No	178	296	474
		Y	No answer	1	4	5
	IF YES: Which degree?					
V	58/	2	Ed.D.	27	44	71
		3	Ph.D.	45	69	114
		Y	No answer	1	5	6
		X	DNA: Not for dissertation	178	296	474
11.	Thinking back, would you say you had some well-defined research plans before you thought of applying to the Regional Research Program?					
V	59/	1	Yes, well-defined	215	329	544
		2	No, had general idea	28	65	93
		3	No, developed later	5	16	21
		Y	No answer	3	4	7
12.	Had you previously submitted a similar proposal to a funding agency?					
V	60/	1	Yes	40	71	111
		2	No	210	340	550
		Y	No answer	1	3	4
	IF YES: (a) Type of agency: (First named 63/; second named 62/; third named 61/.)					
V	61,62, or 63/	1	U.S. Office of Education	24	30	54
		2	Other federal agency	12	17	29
		3	State agency	1	8	9
		4	Private foundation	2	20	22
		5	Other - NEC	1	2	3
		Y	No answer	2	4	6
		X	DNA: Not previously submitted	210	340	550
				(252)	(421)	(673)

12. (Continued)

(b) Did you have to rewrite the proposal before submitting it to the Regional Research Program?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	64/	1	Yes	30	48	78
		2	No	9	23	32
		Y	No answer	2	3	5
		X	DNA: Not previously submitted	210	340	550

IF YES: Modifications made:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	65/	1	Reduced to $10,000	15	21	36
		2	Expanded scope to $10,000	1	1	2
		3	More focus on education	4	12	16
		4	Edited	2	6	8
		5	Reduced and focused more on education	4	3	7
		6	Reduced scope and edited	3	-	3
		7	Expanded and focused more on education	-	1	1
		9	Reduced; focused more on education; edited	-	1	1
		Y	Changes not specified	3	6	9
		X	DNA: No rewrite required or not previously submitted	219	363	582

13. Was the proposal written to extend research in the same specialty in which you had been working, or to begin research in another specialty?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
V	66/	1	Extend research in same specialty	185	309	494
		2	Begin research in another specialty	54	91	145
		Y	No answer	12	14	26
V	69-70/		Second position (See Q 4c)	14	20	34

14. When you were preparing the proposal, did you have access to any of the following resources at your institution?

Available resources:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
II	16/	1	'Information bank'	106	143	249
	17/	1	Sample applications	95	177	272
	18/	1	'Resource person'	179	268	447
	19/	1	Sample proposals	113	168	281
	20/	1	ERIC materials	97	108	205
	21/	1	USOE "Guidelines . . ."	221	323	544
	22/	1	USOE "Winning a Research Bid..."	26	41	67
	23/	1	No available resources	3	28	31
	24/	1	No answer	4	9	13
				(844)	(1265)	(2109)

Resources used:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
26/	1	'Information bank'	49	91	140
27/	1	Sample applications	61	142	203
28/	1	'Resource person'	158	239	397
29/	1	Sample proposals	84	144	228
30/	1	ERIC materials	38	61	99
31/	1	USOE "Guidelines . . ."	212	304	516
32/	1	USOE "Winning a Research Bid..."	14	31	45
33/	1	No resourced used	10	45	55
34/	1	No answer	4	9	13
			(630)	(1066)	(1696)

15. When you submitted this proposal, did you personally know anyone at your institution who was engaged in research that was being funded by an outside agency?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	7/	1	Yes	186	290	476
		2	No	63	122	185
		Y	No answer	2	2	4

IF YES: Was any of this research supported by USOE?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	8/	1	Yes	118	190	308
		2	No	40	52	92
		3	Don't know	27	46	74
		Y	No answer	3	4	7
		X	DNA: Didn't know anyone	63	122	185

16. Does your institution have a policy that requires one or more staff members to critically review a proposal prior to submission?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	9/	1	Yes	96	207	303
		2	No	120	150	270
		3	Don't know	34	53	87
		Y	No answer	1	4	5

17. Apart from institutional requirements, did you ask anyone to critically read your proposal?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	10/	1	Yes	192	349	541
		2	No	55	64	119
		Y	No answer	4	1	5

18. IF ANYONE CRITICALLY READ YOUR PROPOSAL:

(a) What was his position?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
II	36/	1	Researcher, education	59	144	173
	37/	1	Researcher, behavioral science	38	74	112
	38/	1	Researcher, another discipline	14	48	62
	39/	1	Dissertation adviser	49	69	118
	40/	1	Colleague or peer	111	188	299
	41/	1	Administrator	59	132	191
	42/	1	Research coordinator	47	111	158
	43/	1	Bureau director	18	35	53
	44/	1	No internal reviewer	17	27	44
				(412)	(798)	(1210)

Position outside institution:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
48/	1	Researcher, education	20	52	72
49/	1	Researcher, behavioral science	18	25	43
50/	1	Researcher, another discipline	5	16	21
51/	1	Dissertation adviser	10	22	32
52/	1	Colleague or peer	18	50	68
53/	1	Administrator	7	16	23
54/	1	Research coordinator	6	15	21
55/	1	Bureau director	9	8	17
56/	1	No outside reviewer	144	251	395
46,58/	1	No answer	15	9	24
45,57/	1	DNA: Proposal not critically read	26	35	61
			(278)	(499)	(777)

18. (Continued)

(b) As a result of these reviews, did you make any of the following changes?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
II	60/	1	Research design	70	134	204
	61/	1	Review of literature	26	57	83
	62/	1	Educational significance	62	140	202
	63/	1	Application of results	59	125	184
	64/	1	Arranged for consultation	9	32	41
	65/	1	Description of personnel	9	35	44
	69/	1	Description of facilities	15	38	53
	70/	1	Bibliography	16	23	39
	71/	1	Editing and style	95	113	208
	72/	1	Budget	79	156	235
	73/	1	Time schedule	31	55	86
	74/	1	Other (e.g., modes of analysis, increased scope)	-	10	10
	75/	1	None of these changes	24	46	70
	67,77/	1	No answer	22	20	42
	66,76/	1	DNA: Proposal not critically read	26	35	61
				(542)	(1019)	(1562)

19. Before you officially submitted the proposal, did you informally discuss it with anyone from the USOE Regional Office or from Washington?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	15/	1	Yes	115	153	268
		2	No	134	258	392
		Y	No answer	2	3	5

IF YES: (a) With whom did you discuss the proposal?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	16/	1	Regional Director	83	99	182
		2	Staff member, Washington	23	32	55
		4	Regional Director and Washington	9	9	18
		9	Other (e.g., regional intern)	11	11	11
		Y	No answer	2	5	7
		X	DNA: Not discussed with USOE	134	258	392

(b) Was the discussion helpful?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	17/	1	Yes	103	85	188
		2	No	4	48	52
		Y	No answer	10	23	33
		X	DNA: Not discussed with USOE	134	258	392

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
20. As far as preparing the proposal, how would you characterize the USOE's help?						
VI	18/	1	All help needed	120	72	192
		2	Wish there had been more	11	116	127
		3	Didn't seek any help	109	198	307
		Y	No answer	11	28	39
21. Who paid the clerical costs of preparing the proposal?						
VI	19/	1	Department or institution	188	300	488
		2	Another research project	8	8	16
		3	Personally	43	89	132
		5	Both institution and personally	11	14	25
		Y	No answer	1	3	4
22. It is difficult to calculate a precise figure, but what would you guess the clerical costs of your proposal amounted to?						
VI	20/	1	Less than $25	48	88	136
		2	$25-$49	72	121	193
		3	$50-$99	67	102	169
		4	$100 or more	46	75	121
		0	Cannot guess the cost	17	24	41
		Y	No answer	1	4	5
23. Altogether, about how many hours did you actually spend preparing the proposal?						
VI	21-23/		001-020 hours	35	71	106
			021-040	60	109	169
			041-060	44	64	108
			061-080	21	34	55
			081-100	31	51	82
			101-500	42	66	108
			YYY No answer	18	19	37
24. Did you prepare the proposal on your own time or on working time?						
VI	24/	1	Own time	126	221	347
		2	Working time	50	77	127
		3	Both own and working time	72	112	184
		Y	No answer	3	4	7

25. Field readers evaluate each proposal according to four criteria: (1) educational significance; (2) soundness of research design; (3) adequacy of personnel and facilities; and (4) economic efficiency.

(a) Do you think it is appropriate for each proposal to be judged by all of these criteria?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	25/	1	Yes	229	348	577
		2	No	20	57	77
		Y	No answer	2	9	11

IF NO: Should eliminate:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
III	8/	1	Educational significance	4	15	19
	9/	1	Soundness of research design	2	15	17
	10/	1	Adequacy of personnel and facilities	5	15	20
	11/	1	Economic efficiency	11	27	38
	13/	1	No answer	2	11	13
	12/	1	DNA: Present criteria appropriate	229	348	577
				(253)	(431)	(684)

(b) Should other criteria be added?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	27/	1	Yes	24	53	77
		2	No	165	215	380
		Y	No answer	62	146	208

IF YES: Criteria specified:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	29/	1	Significance beyond education	11	20	31
		2	Creativity	8	20	28
		3	Replicability	2	--	2
		4	Dissemination	2	--	2
		9	Other (e.g., theoretical importance; student financial need)	1	10	11
		Y	No answer	62	149	211
		X	DNA: No other criteria needed	165	215	380

26. Do you think that a copy of the comments made by field readers should be sent routinely to each applicant?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	30/	1	Yes, to every applicant	210	362	572
		2	Yes, but only to not funded	14	32	46
		3	Yes, but only to funded	5	--	5
		4	No, not to any applicant	9	6	15
		5	Yes, only if requested	--	2	2
		0	No opinion	10	11	21
		Y	No answer	3	1	4

27. It is not unnatural for field readers to be influenced by their own professional interests and experiences. For each of the groups listed below, please indicate the kind of reviewer who would be most likely to recognize the distinctive aspects of your proposal.

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	31/	1	Education	104	191	295
		2	Psychology	50	59	109
		3	Sociology	15	24	39
		9	Any other	27	57	84
		0	No preference	53	78	131
		Y	No answer	2	5	7

Comparison of choice with major field:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	78/	4	Same as respondent	147	253	400
		5	Different from respondent	49	78	127
		6	Cannot determine, no preference indicated	53	78	131
		Y	No answer	2	5	7

Research interest of reviewers:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	32/	1	Basic research	59	82	141
		2	Applied research	135	219	354
		9	Other (e.g., none necessary)	2	8	10
		0	No preference	51	81	132
		Y	No answer	4	24	28

27. (Continued)

Locale of reviewer:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	33/	1	Major university	98	132	230
		2	Small college	19	45	64
		3	Other educational institution (e.g., State Dept. of Education)	28	61	89
		4	Commercial organization	4	2	6
		9	Other (e.g., School of Nursing)	5	15	20
		0	No preference	90	150	240
		Y	No answer	7	9	16

28. Did you have to wait less time or a longer time than you expected to learn that the proposal was funded?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	34/	1	Less than expected	15	15	30
		2	About what expected	60	129	189
		3	Somewhat longer	64	115	179
		4	Considerably longer	109	151	260
		Y	No answer	3	4	7

31. [30]* Was there anything especially noteworthy, either positive or negative, about the way the USOE Regional Office processed the proposal?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	38/	1	Yes	118	208	326
		2	No	130	179	309
		Y	No answer	3	27	30

IF YES: Positive comments:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VI	39/	2,4	Processing	11	1	12
		5	General administrative handling	31	14	45
		6	Feedback on evaluation	1	6	7
		7	Processing and handling	6	3	9
		8	Handling and feedback	-	4	4
		0	Processing, handling, and feedback	-	1	1
				(49)	(29)	(78)

---

* Bracketed number refers to item number in Not Funded Questionnaire.

31. [30] (Continued)

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
	IF YES:		Negative comments: (first or only comment)			
VI	77/	1,2	Processing	9	10	19
		3	RRP funds	37	13	50
		4,5	General administrative handling	33	61	94
		6	No feedback	--	52	52
		7	Need to be known	--	5	5
		8	USOE implementation of RRP	--	8	8
		9	Other (e.g., "We disagree")	--	36	36
		0	Both processing and handling	1	2	3
				(80)	(187)	(267)
	IF YES:		Negative comments: (second comment)			
VI	76/	1,2	Processing	3	12	15
		3	RRP funds	7	10	17
		4,5	General administrative handling	--	18	18
		6	No feedback	--	2	2
		0	Both RRP funds and feedback	--	1	1
				(10)	(42)	(52)
	39, 77/	Y	No reason stated	4	30	34
	39/	X	DNA: Nothing positive noteworthy	198	355	553
	77/	X	DNA: Nothing negative noteworthy	167	197	364

FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

29. Before contracting for this research, did the USOE Regional Office require changes in the proposed research?

				Funded
III	39/	1	Research design	29
	40/	1	Data collection instruments	8
	41/	1	Sample	5
	42/	1	Modes of analysis	23
	43/	1	Budget	60
	45/	1	Editing	19
	46/	1	Timing of phases	10
	38/	1	Bibliography	3
	44/	1	No changes required	120
	47/	1	Other (e.g., title, consultant)	3
	49/	1	No answer	5
				(285)

IF CHANGES REQUIRED: How did you feel about making these changes?

VI	73/	1	Strengthened the research	52
		2	Of small consequence	63
		3	Detracted from the research	12
		Y	No answer	5
		X	DNA: No changes required	119

30. Did you begin the research on the proposed starting date?

VI	74/	1	Yes	102
		2	No	148
		Y	No answer	1

IF NO: What problems did the change in starting date create, if any?

III	52/	1	Data collection	47
	53/	1	Own work schedule	79
	54/	1	Recruiting staff	36
	55/	1	Paying project costs	34
	56/	1	Contracting for equipment	6
	51/	1	No problems	16
	58/	1	No answer	26
	57/	1	DNA: Began on proposed date	102
				(346)

FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

32. Were you required to obtain clearance from USOE for any data-collection instruments used in this research?

				Funded
VII	7/	1	Yes	51
		2	No	199
		Y	No answer	1

IF YES: (a) How long did it take to get clearance?

				Funded
VII	8-9/	01-03	Three weeks or less	24
		04-99	More than three weeks	21
		YY	No answer	7
		XX	DNA: Not required to obtain clearance	199

(b) Did the time required for clearance create any problems?

				Funded
VII	10/	1	Major obstacles	3
		2	Minor obstacles	11
		3	No particular obstacles	33
		Y	No answer	4
		X	DNA: Not required to obtain clearance	200

(c) Did the USOE clearance require changes in any instruments?

				Funded
VII	11/	1	Deletion of items	4
		3	Editing of items	3
		4	Entire instrument(s) discarded	2
		0	No changes	38
		Y	No answer	4
		X	DNA: Not required to obtain clearance	200

(d) Was USOE clearance helpful, or was it a hindrance?

				Funded
VII	12/	1	Yes, helpful	3
		2	No, a hindrance	8
		3	No effect	36
		Y	No answer	4
		X	DNA: Not required to obtain clearance	200

FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

33. Few researchers can anticipate all the contingencies that arise in a research project. While carrying out this research, did you have to depart from your plans?

				Funded
VII	13/	1	Sample	18
		2	Time schedule (e.g., for data collection, analysis, preparing final report)	59
		3	Instruments or modes of analysis	25
		4	Sample and time schedule	18
		5	Sample and instruments or modes of analysis	5
		6	Time schedule and instruments or modes of analysis	11
		7	Sample, time schedule and instruments or modes of analysis	12
	74/	8	Design	14
	74/	9	Other (e.g., staffing)	2
	13/	0	Did not have to depart from original plans	88
		Y	No answer	4
		X	DNA: Not yet started	1
				(257)

34. Did you encounter problems in obtaining the cooperation of schools or access to subjects?

VII	14/	1	Major problems	14
		2	Minor problems	67
		3	No problems	129
		4	Not applicable: No schools or subjects in study	40
		Y	No answer	1

35. Did you have major difficulty obtaining project help of the following kinds?

III	61/	1	Clerical help	29
	62/	1	Research assistants	16
	63/	1	Cooperation of administrators at own institution	18
	64/	1	Assistance of consultants (or advisors) when needed	15
	60/	1	No major difficulty	193
	65/	1	No answer	3
				(274)

36. Did you find that so much time was spent collecting data that less time for analysis was available than originally planned?

VII	16/	1	Yes	58
		2	No	169
		0	No data collected	18
		Y	No answer	6

FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

37. Did you discover that the project had been underbudgeted in any of the following respects?

				Funded
III	68/	1	Personnel	68
	69/	1	Travel	57
	70/	1	Supplies and materials	38
	71/	1	Communications	13
	72/	1	Services	41
	73/	1	Equipment	13
	74/	1	Final report	10
	67/	1	Project was not underbudgeted	103
	75/	1	No answer	8
				(351)

38. Have you prepared any progress reports for the USOE Regional Office?

				Funded
VII	18/	1	Yes	197
		2	No	27
		0	None required	25
		Y	No answer	2

IF YES: Was the preparation of the progress report much of a problem?

				Funded
VII	19/	1	No, request easily met	132
		2	No, but time could have been better spent	46
		3	Yes, a chore	13
		9	Other (e.g., helped check progress)	4
		Y	No answer	5
		X	DNA: No progress report prepared	51

39. Have you submitted a final report on the project to the USOE Regional Office?

				Funded
VII	20/	1	Yes	120
		2	No	130
		Y	No answer	1

IF YES: (a) Was the final report completed within the grant period?

				Funded
VII	21/	1	Yes	72
		2	No	48
		Y	No answer	1
		X	DNA: Final report not submitted	130

FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

39. (Continued)

(b) Are you currently engaged in research?

			Funded
VII 22/	1	Research on education	48
or	2	Research in another field	18
VII 76/	4	Education and another field	16
	3	Not engaged in research	35
	Y	No answer	4
	X	DNA: Final report not submitted	130

40. If you have not completed this research project, how far have you progressed?

			Funded
VII 23/	1	Just received grant	5
	2	One-fourth completed	2
	3	One-half completed	21
	4	Three-fourths completed	32
	5	Nearly completed	69
	Y	No answer	2
	X	DNA: Final report completed	120

41. Have you submitted another proposal to the Regional Research Program?

			Funded
VII 24/	1	Yes	37
or	2	No	214
VII 77/			

IF YES: What is the status of this proposal?

			Funded
VII 25/	1	Funded	9
or	2	Pending	21
VII 78/	3	Not funded	7
	X	DNA: Did not submit another proposal	214

NOT FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

[29]* Did you ask for an explanation of the decision?

				Not Funded
VI	35/	1	Yes	288
		2	No	121
		Y	No answer	5

IF YES: (a) Qualities of proposal criticized:

				Not Funded
III	15/	1	Educational significance	87
	16/	1	Soundness of design	106
	17/	1	Adequacy of personnel and facilities	14
	18/	1	Economic efficiency	18
	19/	1	Other (e.g., review of literature)	12

Other explanation:

			Not Funded
20/	1	No RRP funds	34
21/	1	No explanation provided	46
22/	1	Conflicting priority (e.g., within ERIC/CRIER)	14
23/	1	Vague, broad generalities	12
25/	1	No answer	21
24/	1	DNA: Didn't ask for explanation of decision	121
			(485)

(b) How satisfied were you with the explanation?

				Not Funded
VI	37/	1	Very satisfied	6
		2	Fairly	45
		3	Not	213
		Y	No answer	29
		X	DNA: Didn't ask	121

[31] Did the Regional Director of Educational Research suggest other funding agencies to which you might apply for support?

				Not Funded
VI	41/	1	Yes	26
		2	No	372
		3	Does not recall	4
		Y	No answer	12

[32] Have you made other attempts to have this proposal funded?

				Not Funded
VI	42/	1	Yes	118
		2	No	290
		3	No answer	6

*Henceforth bracketed number refers to item number in Not Funded Questionnaire.

NOT FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

[32] (Continued)

IF YES: (a) Where did you seek support?

				Not Funded
III	27/	1	Institution of affiliation	54
	29/	1	USOE	6
	30/	1	Other federal agency	15
	31/	1	State government	10
	32/	1	Private foundation	21
	33/	1	Other, not specified	9
	34/	1	Other (e.g., business, AFT)	7
	36/	1	No answer	7
	35/	1	DNA: Did not seek support	290
				(419)

(b) When did you contact them?

VI	44/	1	While proposal considered by USOE	33
		2	After USOE rejection	78
		Y	No answer	13
		X	DNA: Did not seek support	290

(c) What is the status of the proposal?

VI	45/	1	Funded	73
		2	Pending	13
		3	Not funded	28
		Y	No answer	10
		X	DNA: Did not seek support	290

[33] Have you submitted another proposal to the Regional Research Program?

VI	46/	1	Yes	35
or		2	No	376
VII	77/	Y	No answer	3

IF YES: What is the status of the proposal?

VI	47/	1	Funding	7
or		2	Pending	10
VII	78/	3	Not funded	18
		Y	No answer	3
		X	DNA: No other proposal submitted to RRP	376

NOT FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

[34] Are you currently engaged in research?

				Not Funded
VI	48/	1	Yes	267
		2	No	146
		Y	No answer	1

IF YES: Field:

VI	49/	1	Education	184
or		2	Another field (name of field in I 7-8/)	56
VII	76/	4	Both education and another field	25
		Y	No answer	3
		X	DNA: Not currently engaged in research	146

IF NO: Any plans to begin a project?

VI	50/	1	Yes	63
		2	No	59
		Y	No answer	25
		X	DNA: Engaged in research	267

IF YES: Field:

VI	51/	1	Education	54
		2	Another field (name of field in I 7-8/)	6
		3	Both education and another field	3
		Y	No answer	25
		X	DNA: No research plans	326

[35] Not funded applicant was asked to state the title of his current research project. This title was compared with the one on the proposal.

VI	60/	1	Same as proposal	36
		2	Not same; different focus	156
		3	Not same; parallel focus	58
		Y	Title not stated	18
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	146

NOT FUNDED APPLICANTS ONLY

[36] Duration of project:

			Not Funded
VI	52-53/	Month beginning	
VI	54-55/	Year beginning	
		1966 or before	16
		1967	16
		1968	64
		1969 or later	94
		YY No answer	78
		XX DNA: Not engaged in research	146

			Not Funded
VI	56-57/	Month ending	
VI	58-59/	Year ending	
		1969 or before	59
		1970 or later	89
		YY No answer	120
		XX DNA: Not engaged in research	146

[37] Source of funds:
(First agency named 65/; second named 64/; if self named 63/)

				Not Funded
VI	64,65/	1	USOE	34
		2	Other federal agency	31
		3	State agency	18
		4	Private foundation	8
		5	Commercial organization	3
		6	Educational organization	3
		7	Current institution	89
		8	"Private donations"	5
		9	Other (e.g., municipal government)	6
		0	Local school	16
	63/	1	Self	54
	65/	Y	No answer	33
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	146
				(446)

[38] Amount of support:

			Not Funded
VI	66-71/	$10,000 or less	103
		$10,001-$50,000	34
		More than $50,000	21
		YYYYYY Not specified	110
		XXXXXX DNA: Not engaged in research	146

42. [39] Have any students assisted you on this project?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 26/	1	Yes	164	169	333
	2	No	86	92	178
	Y	No answer	1	7	8
	X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

IF YES: As a result of their experience on this project, have any of them decided they will do further work in research?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 27/	1	Yes	82	104	186
	2	No	12	5	17
	3	Don't know	69	57	126
	Y	No answer	2	10	12
	X	DNA: No students assisted on project	86	238	324

43. [40] Has this project been discussed in any class?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 28/	1	Yes, but no data presented	91	75	166
	2	Yes, and data presented	95	98	193
	4	Discussed both with and without presenting data	1	8	9
	3	Not discussed	34	43	77
	0	Not applicable	29	32	61
	Y	No answer	1	12	13
	X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

44. [41] Has this research led to the addition of new materials to course reading lists?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 29/	1	Yes	83	131	214
	2	No	161	117	278
	Y	No answer	7	20	27
	X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

45. [42] Are data from this project being used by students for independent study projects? For master's essays? For doctoral dissertations?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 30/	1	Independent study projects	38	37	75
	2	Master's essays	5	19	24
	3	Doctoral dissertations	37	27	64
	4	Independent study projects and master's essays	12	15	27
	5	Independent study projects and doctoral dissertations	5	14	19
	6	Master's essays and doctoral dissertations	4	7	11
	7	Independent study projects, master's essays, and doctoral dissertations	6	13	19
	0	Not applicable	138	117	255
	Y	No answer	6	19	25
	X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

46. [43] Have you encouraged any students to pursue this line of research for independent study projects? For master's essays? For doctoral dissertations?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 31/	1	Independent study projects	37	29	66
	2	Master's essays	11	21	32
	3	Doctoral dissertations	32	33	65
	4	Independent study projects and master's essays	19	15	34
	5	Independent study projects and doctoral dissertations	11	18	29
	6	Master's essays and doctoral dissertations	9	12	21
	7	Independent study projects, master's essays, and doctoral dissertations	14	23	37
	0	Not applicable	113	99	212
	Y	No answer	5	18	23
	X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

47. [44] Since you have undertaken this project, do you find that students are more likely to seek your advice regarding M.A. or doctoral theses?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII	32/	1	Students are more likely to seek my advice	68	88	156
		2	No noticeable change	69	58	127
		0	Not applicable	111	105	216
		Y	No answer	3	17	20
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

48. [45] As a result of this research, have you recommended that any course or curriculum content be modified?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IV	8/	1	I have planned a new course	35	44	79
	9/	1	I have revised one or more courses	43	66	109
	10/	1	I have recommended greater emphasis on certain topics or the addition of new materials	66	87	153
	11/	1	I have suggested courses in allied disciplines to students	15	42	57
	12/	1	Other (e.g., new major, summer work conference)	19	11	30
	13/	1	I have not recommended any changes	107	99	206
	15/	1	No answer	12	26	38
	14/	1	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
				(297)	(521)	(818)

49. [46] Have you been invited to discuss this research with a faculty or student group?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IV	17/	1	Faculty seminar in my department	62	72	134
	18/	1	Interdepartmental faculty seminar	32	44	76
	19/	1	Faculty-student seminar in my department	57	56	113
	20/	1	Interdepartmental faculty-student seminar	23	33	56
	21/	1	Student society	16	20	36
	22/	1	Have not been invited	110	100	210
	24/	1	No answer	6	28	34
	23/	1	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
				(306)	(499)	(805)

50. [47] Have you presented (or will you present) a paper based on this project at a state, regional or national meeting of a professional society?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII	35/	1,3	Yes	159	167	326
		2	No	92	79	171
		Y	No answer	-	22	22
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

IF YES: At what meeting(s)?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII	36/	1	State meeting	14	19	33
		2	Regional meeting	20	22	42
		3	National meeting	69	59	128
		4	State and regional meeting	10	9	19
		5	State and national meeting	8	7	15
		6	Regional and national meeting	6	7	13
		7	State, regional, and national meeting	11	16	27
I	9/	8	International meeting	5	11	16
VII	41/	9	Invited lecture	17	18	35
	36/	Y	No answer	4	26	30
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research or no paper presented	92	231	323
				(256)	(425)	(681)

IF YOU HAVE NO PLANS TO PUBLISH: Please state your reason for not doing so.

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
I	16/	1	Time too limited (e.g., can't find time to analyze data; other interests take priority)	7	4	11
		2	Premature (e.g., depends on research results)	11	9	20
		3	Research too limited (e.g., scope of effort only of local interest; project only part of a larger one; follow-up research needed; not significant)	7	4	11
		4	Another investigator to do so (e.g., PI; doctoral candidate; project evaluator; consultant)	4	2	6

50. [47] (Continued)

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
I	16/	5	Other (e.g., manuscript inappropriate--films from research are "publications"; TV program materials; project to develop a particular curriculum; final report suffices)	4	1	5
		6	No reason given	11	6	17
		Y	No answer	35	56	91
		X	DNA: Plans to publish or not engaged in research	172	332	504

51. [48] Are you writing (or have you written) any manuscripts for publication based on this research?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII	37/	1	Yes	174	186	360
		2	No	77	69	146
		Y	No answer	-	13	13
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

IF YES: What does this include?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII	38/	1	Journal article	123	110	233
		2	Book or part of a book	10	15	25
		9	Other (e.g., limited circulation report, musical score, test manual)	14	15	29
		4	Journal article and book or part of book	19	32	51
		5	Journal article and other	2	7	9
		6	Book or part of book and other	1	1	2
		7	Journal article, book or part of book, and other	2	-	2
		Y	No answer	3	19	22
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research or no plans to publish	77	215	292

51. [48] (Continued)

IF JOURNAL ARTICLE: Subject classification of journal

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
I	10-11/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	-	3	3
		11	Educational administration	-	1	1
		13	Research and statistics	3	3	6
		14	Teacher training	-	1	1
		15	AV and instructional technology	2	1	3
		16	Special education (e.g., adult, higher)	6	3	9
		17	Classroom teaching	7	9	16
		18	Vocational and applied arts (e.g., agriculture)	4	4	8
		20	General psychology	1	1	2
		21	Developmental	3	-	3
		22	Guidance and counseling	2	3	5
		24	Personality	1	-	1
		25	Testing and measurement	2	-	2
		26	Educational psychology	3	1	4
		27	Clinical psychology	1	-	1
		28	Exceptional children	1	2	3
		31	Sociology	1	-	1
		32	Political science	2	-	2
		33	History	-	2	2
		34	Other social science	1	4	5
		35	Math; physical; biological sciences	3	8	11
		36	English and language arts	8	5	13
		37	Music and art	2	6	8
		38	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	-	4	4
		39	Professional or honorary society journal (e.g., AAUP Bulletin, Phi Delta Kappan)	3	1	4
		YY	Journal not specified	91	102	193
		XX	DNA: Not publishing or not engaged in research	104	250	354

12-14/ See Appendix B for detailed listing of professional societies which sponsor journals

52. [49] Have you received requests for copies of any written materials based on this project?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IV	26/	1	Proposal	83	57	140
	27/	1	Instruments used in research	42	54	96
	28/	1	Preliminary report	47	66	113
	29/	1	Project memoranda, etc.	11	24	35
	30/	1	Final report	133	78	211
	31/	1	Other (e.g., data, visit to lab)	22	11	33
	32/	1	No request received	63	87	150
	34/	1	No answer	-	28	28
	33/	1	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
				(401)	(551)	(952)

53. [50] As a result of this research, have you received any of the following requests or invitations?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII	44/	1	Asked by colleague to critically read a paper	83	87	170
		2	Not asked	149	119	268
		Y	No answer	19	62	81
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
	45/	1	Asked by a journal to evaluate an article on a related topic	24	31	55
		2	Not asked	206	161	367
		Y	No answer	21	76	97
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
				(502)	(828)	(1330)
	46/	1	Asked by a journal to review a book on a related topic	15	23	38
		2	Not asked	217	169	386
		Y	No answer	19	76	95
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
	47/	1	Approached by a publisher about writing a book on this subject	33	45	78
		2	Not approached	198	153	351
		Y	No answer	20	70	90
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
	48/	1	Asked by a funding agency to evaluate a proposal in this or a related area of research	13	21	34
		2	Not asked	217	170	387
		Y	No answer	21	77	98
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

53. [50] (Continued)				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII	49/	1	Invited by a funding agency to submit a proposal for further research in the area	16	20	36
		2	Not invited	214	167	381
		X	No answer	21	81	102
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

54. [51] Since you have had this research experience, have you been asked to serve as a consultant for any of the following groups?

IV	36/	1	Board of Education	30	53	83
	37/	1	State Department of Education	33	44	77
	38/	1	Federal Government	13	25	38
	39/	1	Commercial producer of learning materials	17	27	44
	40/	1	Single educational institution	23	34	57
	41/	1	No requests received	157	120	277
	43/	1	No answer	19	38	57
	42/	1	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
				(292)	(487)	(779)

55. [52] Was your teaching load reduced to enable you to devote more time to this research?

VII	51/	1	Yes	83	63	146
		2	No	108	145	253
		0	Do not teach	58	47	105
		Y	No answer	2	13	15
		X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

56. [53] As a result of working on this project, have you improved your skills in any of the following areas?

Part I.

IV	45/	1	Supervising research assistance	115	100	215
	46/	1	Expository writing	112	100	212
	47/	1	Research budgeting	163	102	265
	48/	1	Developing a research design	160	144	304
	49/	1	Sampling techniques	64	68	132
	50/	1	Survey techniques (interviewing, questionnaire construction)	61	67	128
	51/	1	Locating relevant literature through ERIC	51	46	97
	52/	1	Utilizing general library resources	53	65	118
	53/	1	Computer programming	80	84	164
	54/	1	Modes of analysis	133	128	261
				(992)	(904)	(1896)

56. [53] (Continued)

Part II. Modes of Analysis:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
IV 58/	1	Analysis of covariance	36	41	77
59/	1	Analysis of variance	57	58	115
60/	1	Correlation or regression analysis	38	56	94
61/	1	Descriptive analysis (non-analytical)	30	29	59
62/	1	Discriminant function analysis	9	11	20
63/	1	Factor or cluster analysis	15	26	41
64/	1	Qualitative or historical analysis	7	18	25
65/	1	Tests of significance (t tests, chi-square, non-parametric, etc.)	61	65	126
66/	1	Other (e.g., item analysis, trend analysis, Q-sort)	13	13	26
67/	1	No improvement indicated in any of above modes of analysis	-	3	3
56/	1	No answer Part I	13	50	63
69/	1	No answer Part II	3	36	39
55/	1	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146
68/	1	DNA: Not engaged in research or modes of analysis (54/) not checked	115	248	363
			(397)	(800)	(1197)

57. [54] What effect has this research experience had on your interest in doing research on education?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 54/	1	Strengthened interest in doing research on education	176	130	306
	2	No appreciable effect	65	88	153
	3	Diminished interest	7	24	31
	Y	No answer	3	26	29
	X	DNA: Not engaged in research	-	146	146

58. [55] What is your employment status now?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 55/	1	Employed full-time	199	344	543
	2	Employed part-time	9	16	25
	3	Graduate student full-time	8	3	11
	4	Graduate student part-time	2	-	2
	5	Employed full-time and employed part-time	-	3	3
	6	Employed full-time and graduate student part-time	20	29	49
	7	Employed part-time and graduate student full-time	2	2	4
	8	Employed part-time and graduate student part-time	2	8	10
	9	Other (e.g., housewife)	7	6	13
	0	Graduate student part-time and other	-	1	1
	Y	No answer	2	2	4

59. [56] Are you still employed by the organization where you were when you submitted the proposal to USOE, or have you moved?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 56/	1	Yes, still at same organization	175	288	463
	2	No, has moved	57	111	168
	Y	No answer	5	9	14
	X	DNA: Not employed	14	6	20

IF MOVED: (a) What is your main organizational affiliation now?

VII 57-62/ For organizational ID, see Nash file (BASR #B1050).

(b) What is your position? (See Appendix A for refined classification in VII 63-64/)

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 63/	0	Research Director	4	11	15
	1	Faculty	40	66	106
	2	Student assistant or fellow	1	4	5
	3	Administrative officer	5	12	17
	4	Program Director	2	5	7
	5	Counselor or Consultant	4	7	11
	7	Teacher	-	3	3
	8	School administrator	1	1	2
	Y	No answer	6	12	18
	X	DNA: Still at same organization	188	293	481

	F	NF
Prof.	5	7
Assoc.	9	13
Ass't.	22	41
Other	4	5

59. [56] (Continued)

(c) At this new organization, about how much time do you devote to research?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 65/	1	More time than at former location	8	30	38
	2	About the same amount of time	21	30	51
	3	Less time	19	28	47
	0	None	9	21	30
	Y	No answer	6	12	18
	X	DNA: Still at same organization	188	293	481

(d) Did this move to another organization represent a promotion?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 66/	1	Yes	42	79	121
	2	No	12	11	23
	3	Not sure	4	19	23
	Y	No answer	5	11	16
	X	DNA: Still at same organization	188	294	482

IF YES: Do you attribute the promotion to your research efforts?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 67/	1	Yes	10	20	30
	2	Partly	24	31	55
	3	No	8	26	34
	4	Don't know	-	2	2
	Y	No answer	5	11	16
	X	DNA: Move not a promotion or did not move	204	324	528

(e) Did you receive a salary increase when you made this move?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 68/	1	Yes	48	93	141
	2	No	9	17	26
	Y	No answer	6	10	16
	X	DNA: Still at same organization	188	294	482

IF YES: Do you attribute the increase to your research efforts?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VII 69/	1	Yes	10	16	26
	2	Partly	25	36	61
	3	No	11	38	49
	4	Don't know	2	3	5
	Y	No answer	6	10	16
	X	DNA: No salary increase when moved, or did not move	197	311	508

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
60. [57]		Have you been promoted since you started this research project?			
VII 70/	1	Yes	47	90	137
	2	No	122	187	309
	Y	No answer	10	19	29
	X	DNA: Moved to another organization	72	118	190
		IF YES: Do you attribute the promotion to your research efforts?			
VII 71/	1	Yes	6	13	19
	2	Partly	31	41	72
	3	No	7	31	38
	4	Don't know	3	3	6
	Y	No answer	10	21	31
	X	DNA: Not promoted or moved	194	305	499
61. [58]		Have you received a salary increase?			
VII 72/	1	Yes	149	260	409
	2	No	18	19	37
	Y	No answer	12	17	29
	X	DNA: Moved to another organization	72	118	190
		IF YES: Do you attribute the increase to your research efforts?			
VII 73/	1	Yes	11	21	32
	2	Partly	63	84	147
	3	No	61	139	200
	4	Don't know	12	11	23
	Y	No answer	14	22	36
	X	DNA: No salary increase or moved	90	137	227
39. [34]		Are you currently engaged in research?			
VII 76/	1	Research on education	48	184	232
	2	Research in another field	18	56	74
	4	Research on education and another field	16	25	41
	3	Not engaged in research	35	146	181
	Y	No answer	4	3	7
	X	DNA: RRP project not completed	130	-	130

IF CURRENTLY ENGAGED IN RESEARCH OR PLANNING A PROJECT: Name of field other than education.

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
I	7-8/	10	Health and recreation	2	1	3
		18	Applied arts (e.g., agriculture)	1	3	4
		20	General psychology	8	11	19
		21	Developmental	1	2	3
		22	Guidance and counseling	-	3	3
		23	Learning	1	-	1
		26	Educational psychology	-	1	1
		28	Exceptional children	-	1	1
		31	Sociology	3	3	6
		32	Political science	1	2	3
		33	History	2	4	6
		34	Other social science	5	19	24
		35	Math, physical, biological sciences	1	19	20
		36	English and language arts	7	13	20
		37	Music and art	1	5	6
		38	Other professions (e.g., law, medicine)	1	3	4
		YY	No answer	1	2	3
		XX	DNA: Not engaged in research in another field	216	322	538

41. [33] Have you submitted another proposal to the Regional Research Program?

VII	77/	1	Yes	37	35	72
		2	No	214	376	590
		Y	No answer	-	3	3

IF YES: What is the status of this proposal?

VII	78/	1	Funded	9	7	16
		2	Pending	21	10	31
		3	Not funded	7	18	25
		Y	No answer	-	3	3
		X	DNA: Did not submit another proposal	214	376	590

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
62. [59] At present, how do you divide your professional time?					
Percent time Curriculum or Program Development:					
VIII	7-8/	01-20	43	118	161
		21-40	19	40	59
		41-60	9	17	26
		61-80	2	5	7
		81-100	2	5	7
	RR, 00	No time this area	169	219	388
	YY	No answer	5	8	13
	XX	Retired	2	2	4
Percent time Research:					
VIII	9-10/	01-20	66	123	189
		21-40	56	67	123
		41-60	30	29	59
		61-80	7	14	21
		81-100	6	13	19
	RR, 00	No time this area	78	158	236
	YY	No answer	6	8	14
	XX	Retired	2	2	4
Percent time Services:					
VIII	11-12/	01-20	48	88	136
		21-40	5	15	20
		41-60	6	11	17
		61-80	4	6	10
		81-100	4	4	8
	RR, 00	No time this area	176	280	456
	YY	No answer	6	8	14
	XX	Retired	2	2	4
Percent time Working toward Degree:					
VIII	13-14/	01-20	14	25	39
		21-40	4	9	13
		41-60	4	4	8
		61-80	1	2	3
		81-100	8	3	11
	YY	No answer	3	2	5
	RR, 00, XX	DNA: Not working toward degree	217	369	586

62. [59] (Continued)

IF WORKING TOWARD DEGREE:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	15/	2	Ed.D.	13	17	30
		3	Ph.D.	20	23	43
		Y	No answer	1	5	6
		X	DNA: Not working toward degree	217	369	586

Percent time Teaching:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	16-17/	01-20		13	42	55
		21-40		36	74	110
		41-60		69	81	150
		61-80		32	60	92
		81-100		27	43	70
	RR,	00	No time this area	66	104	170
		YY	No answer	6	8	14
		XX	Retired	2	2	4

Percent time Administration or other

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	18-19/	01-20		38	55	93
		21-40		27	49	76
		41-60		18	34	52
		61-80		10	28	38
		81-100		14	25	39
	RR,	00	No time this area	137	212	349
		YY	No answer	5	9	14
		XX	Retired	2	2	4

63. [60] At present, are you an advisor for doctoral dissertations?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	20/	1	Yes	69	102	171
		2	No	177	300	477
		Y	No answer	5	12	17

IF YES: About how many students are you currently advising?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	21-22/	01-03	Three or less	28	44	72
		04-09	Four to nine	26	38	64
		10-40	Ten or more	8	18	26
		00,YY	No answer	12	14	26
		XX	DNA: Not advisor for doctoral dissertations	177	300	477

64. [61] If you have had teaching experience:

(a) Years taught in elementary or secondary school

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	23-24/	01-03	One to three	52	90	142
		04-06	Four to six	34	66	100
		07-09	Seven to nine	26	31	57
		10-13	Ten to thirteen	12	32	44
		14-19	Fourteen to nineteen	13	32	45
		20-40	Twenty or more	7	13	20
		RR,00	No teaching this level	103	147	250
		YY	No answer	4	3	7

(b) Years taught college undergraduates

VIII	25-26/	01-03	One to three	54	86	140
		04-06	Four to six	52	96	148
		07-09	Seven to nine	23	46	69
		10-13	Ten to thirteen	24	39	63
		14-19	Fourteen to nineteen	21	19	40
		20-41	Twenty or more	16	36	52
		RR,00	No teaching this level	57	90	147
		YY	No answer	4	2	6

(c) Years taught graduate students

VIII	27-28/	01-03	One to three	73	104	177
		04-06	Four to six	46	70	116
		07-09	Seven to nine	19	34	53
		10-13	Ten to thirteen	17	18	35
		14-19	Fourteen to nineteen	7	11	18
		20-35	Twenty or more	10	17	27
		RR,00	No teaching this level	75	157	232
		YY	No answer	4	3	7

(d) Years done other types of teaching

VIII	29-30/	01-03	One to three	27	45	72
		04-06	Four to six	3	29	32
		07-09	Seven to nine	1	7	8
		10-13	Ten to thirteen	2	12	14
		14-19	Fourteen to nineteen	4	4	8
		20-38	Twenty or more	1	8	9
		RR,00	No teaching this area	209	305	514
		YY	No answer	4	4	8

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
65. [62]			Are you a member of any national professional societies?			
VIII	31/	1	Yes	240	383	623
		2	No	9	22	31
		Y	No answer	2	9	11
	IF YES:		Which two are of greatest value to you? (Subject classification, FIRST named society)			
I	17-18/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	5	17	22
		11	Educational administration	5	4	9
		12	Curriculum	2	8	10
		13	Research and statistics	34	63	97
		14	Teacher training	1	2	3
		15	AV and instructional technology	3	6	9
		16	Special education (e.g., adult, higher)	6	10	16
		17	Classroom teaching	18	40	58
		18	Vocational and applied arts	11	10	21
		20	General psychology	39	34	73
		21	Developmental	5	2	7
		22	Guidance and counseling	17	18	35
		28	Exceptional children	2	9	11
		31	Sociology	8	15	23
		32	Political science	3	4	7
		33	History	2	2	4
		34	Other social science	10	19	29
		35	Math; physical; biological sciences	9	21	30
		36	English and language arts	23	24	47
		37	Music and art	16	23	39
		38	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	2	7	9
		39	Profession as role (e.g., AAUP) or honorary society (e.g., Phi Delta Kappa)	14	36	50
		YY	No answer	13	21	34
		XX	DNA: Not member of professional society	3	19	22

I 19-21/ See Appendix B for detailed listing of professional societies.

65. [62] (Continued)

(Subject classification, SECOND named society)

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
I	22-23/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	4	9	13
		11	Educational administration	3	13	16
		12	Curriculum	4	6	10
		13	Research and statistics	25	38	63
		14	Teacher training	-	2	2
		15	AV and instructional technology	3	7	10
		16	Special education (e.g., adult, higher)	4	10	14
		17	Classroom teaching	17	34	51
		18	Vocational and applied arts	3	8	11
		20	General psychology	13	19	32
		21	Developmental	3	3	6
		22	Guidance and counseling	12	21	33
		25	Testing and measurement	3	3	6
		26	Educational psychology	-	1	1
		28	Exceptional children	7	9	16
		31	Sociology	2	8	10
		32	Political science	2	3	5
		33	History	2	5	7
		34	Other social science	10	15	25
		35	Math; physical; biological sciences	9	11	20
		36	English and language arts	15	18	33
		37	Music and art	7	8	15
		38	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	2	5	7
		39	Profession as role (e.g., AAUP) or honorary society (e.g., Phi Delta Kappa).	34	41	75
		YY	No answer	64	98	162
		XX	DNA: Not member of professional society	3	19	22

I 24-26/ See Appendix B for detailed listing of professional societies.

66. [63] Within the last two years have you attended a meeting of an academic or professional society?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII 36/	1	Yes	237	372	609
	2	No	13	36	49
	Y	No answer	1	6	7

67. [64] Have you ever been a field reader for the U.S. Office of Education?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	37/	1	Yes	19	27	46
		2	No	231	383	614
		Y	No answer	1	4	5

IF YES: About how many proposals have you reviewed?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	38-39/	01-05	One to five	3	5	8
		06-10	Six to ten	6	7	13
		11-20	Eleven to twenty	3	4	7
		21-99	Twenty-one or more	5	8	13
		00,YY	No answer	3	7	10
		XX	DNA: Has not been a field reader for USOE	231	383	614

IF NO: Do you know anyone who is (or has been) a field reader?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	40/	1	Yes	83	108	191
		2	No	90	151	241
		Y	No answer	59	128	187
		X	DNA: Has been a field reader for USOE himself	19	27	46

68. [65] Have you ever been a consultant to the U.S. Office of Education?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	41/	1	Yes	16	28	44
		2	No	231	374	605
		Y	No answer	4	12	16

69. [66] How many research studies (articles, monographs, or books) have you published, and what was the date of your first publication?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
Article(s):						
VIII	42-43/	01	One	22	39	61
		02	Two	15	39	54
		03	Three	17	18	35
		04	Four	17	18	35
		05-10	Five to ten	42	67	109
		11-25	Eleven to twenty-five	31	44	75
		26-90	Twenty-six or more	16	28	44
		YY	No answer	8	14	22
		RR,00	Published but not articles	10	10	20
		XX	No publications	73	137	210
Monograph(s):						
VIII	44-45/	01	One	18	33	51
		02-05	Two to five	24	30	54
		06-60	Six or more	8	16	24
		YY	No answer	8	15	23
		RR,00	Published but not monographs	120	183	303
		XX	No publications	73	137	210
Book(s):						
VIII	46-47/	01	One	26	39	65
		02-05	Two to five	21	32	53
		06-21	Six or more	3	9	12
		YY	No answer	8	14	22
		RR,00	Published but not book	120	183	303
		XX	No publications	73	137	210
Date of first publication:						
VIII	48-49/		1970	1	1	2
			1968-1969	22	24	46
			1964-1967	62	96	158
			1956-1963	46	76	122
			1940-1955	31	50	81
			Prior to 1940	6	11	17
		YY	No answer	10	19	29
		XX	No publications	73	137	210

70. [67] Some researchers . . . seek recognition from behavioral scientists outside education, while others seek recognition from researchers within education or from school practitioners. Whose judgment is most important to you?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII 51/	1	Researchers within education	77	131	208
	2	Researchers outside education	84	113	197
	3	School practitioners	54	91	145
	0	None of these	23	57	80
	Y	No answer	13	22	35

71. [68] Through a variety of sources, researchers get an impression of funding agencies. Do you think the RRP is limited to a few areas of special interest, or does it cover a broad range of interests in education?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII 52/	1	Few areas of special interest	22	156	178
	2	Broad range of interests	141	72	213
	0	No impression	85	181	266
	Y	No answer	3	5	8

72. [69] Do you think the USOE RRP tends to be orthodox or venturesome in their support of research?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII 53/	1	Orthodox	62	257	319
	2	Venturesome	102	22	124
	0	No opinion	86	130	216
	Y	No answer	1	5	6

73. [70] As far as departures from the original proposal are concerned, is it your opinion that the RRP tends to be fairly strict or somewhat permissive?

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII 54/	1	Fairly strict	43	83	126
	2	Fairly permissive	115	41	156
	0	No opinion	91	283	374
	Y	No answer	2	7	9

74. [71] In comparing the procedures that an applicant must follow when submitting a proposal to RRP with those required elsewhere, would you say the RRP involves more, about the same, or somewhat less "red tape"?

		Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII 55/	1 More "red tape"	31	94	125
	2 About the same amount	92	148	240
	3 Somewhat less	58	49	107
	0 No opinion	69	117	186
	Y No answer	1	6	7

75. [72] Some researchers view the regulation requiring clearance of educational data-gathering instruments as a good idea, whereas others regard it as an unwarranted intrusion by USOE.

VIII 56/	1 Good idea	80	141	221
	2 Unwarranted intrusion	50	89	139
	0 No opinion	115	175	290
	Y No answer	6	9	15

76. [73] Have you ever submitted any data-gathering instruments to USOE for clearance?

VIII 57/	1 Yes	67	73	140
	2 No	182	331	513
	Y No answer	2	10	12

77. [74] As you may know, it is standard practice for USOE to withhold a fixed percentage of a grant until the final report has been approved. Do you think this is a good idea?

VIII 58/	1 Agree	163	242	405
	2 Disagree	39	61	100
	0 No opinion	46	106	152
	Y No answer	3	5	8

78. [75] The USOE RRP encourages significant small scale educational research projects. What do you think the ceiling on funds should be for small project research?

		Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII 59-61/ (entered as hundreds of dollars)	$ 500	1	-	1
	700	-	1	1
	2,000	-	3	3
	3,000	-	2	2
	4,000	-	1	1
	5,000	2	12	14
	6,000	-	1	1
	6,500	-	1	1
	7,000	-	2	2
	7,500	1	2	3
	10,000	70	151	221
	11,000	-	1	1
	12,000	17	5	22
	12,500	3	6	9
	13,500	3	-	3
	14,000	-	1	1
	15,000	71	61	132
	17,500	9	4	13
	20,000	38	55	93
	22,500	2	-	2
	25,000	12	28	40
	30,000	-	3	3
	50,000	5	4	9
	Unlimited	1	1	2
	No answer	16	69	85
	MEDIANS	$14,500	$10,000	$14,500

79. [76] If you were to get a research grant for $10,000 or less, do you have any preference about the source of the grant?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	64/	1	Government agency	40	42	82
		2	Private foundation	34	85	119
		9	Other (e.g., private donations, local schools)	6	12	18
		0	No preference	169	269	438
		Y	No answer	2	6	8

IF PREFERENCE: Which of the following influenced your choice?

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
VIII	65/	1	Absence of "red tape" in preparing proposal	36	70	106
	66/	1	Promptness of notification regarding support	29	54	83
	67/	1	Method of proposal review	18	60	78
	68/	1	Freedom to modify research plans	38	62	100
	69/	1	Amount of project monitoring by funding agency	21	30	51
	70/	1	Little likelihood of budgetary cutback	27	48	75
	71/	1	Latitude in preparation of final report	32	47	79
	72/	1	Copyright privileges	11	26	37
	73/	1	Other (e.g., receptive to new ideas, sympathetic to local concerns)	17	20	37
	75/	1	No answer	7	11	18
	74/	1	DNA: No preference	169	269	438
				(405)	(697)	(1102)

80. [77] Colleges and universities where earned a degree.

IX 7-12/ Institution for first-named degree. See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID.
A

(1) Earned degree (first named):

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX	13/	1	BA	149	213	362
		2	MA or MBA	2	12	14
		4	Ed.D.	2	6	8
		5	Ph.D.	6	15	21
		6	BS	91	154	245
		7	MS	-	3	3
		9	Professional degree (e.g., MD, DDS)	-	1	1
		Y	No answer	-	4	4
		X	DNA: No earned degree	1	6	7

(2) Year of Degree (first named):

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX	14-15/		1919-1929	5	15	20
			1930-1938	11	27	38
			1939-1945	19	34	53
			1946-1950	46	78	124
			1951-1954	44	62	106
			1955-1958	55	82	137
			1959-1962	49	67	116
			1962-1969	19	35	54
		YY	No answer	2	8	10
		XX	DNA: No earned degree	1	6	7

(3) Major field (first named): (Mapped variable, see Appendix D for detailed classifications.)

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX	16-17/		Education (e.g., elementary, secondary, curriculum, audio-visual)	28	70	98
			Educational administration	2	5	7
			Vocational and applied arts (e.g., industrial arts, home economics)	19	25	44
			Psychology	46	48	94
			Social science	34	74	108
			Math, physical and biological sciences	48	84	132
			English, philosophy, and language arts	43	58	101
			Music and art	18	27	45
			Profession (e.g., medicine, law, business)	9	8	17
		00,YY	No answer	3	9	12
		XX	DNA: No earned degree	1	6	7

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
(4) Degree in education (first named):						
IX	18/	1	Yes	75	151	226
		2	No	172	251	423
		Y	No answer	3	6	9
		X	DNA: No earned degree	1	6	7

IX B 19-24/ Institution for second-named degree. See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID.

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
(1) Earned degree (second named):						
IX	25/	1	BA	5	5	10
		2	MA or MBA	110	202	312
		3	M.Ed.	44	54	98
		4	Ed.D.	1	4	5
		5	Ph.D.	13	17	30
		6	BS	4	6	10
		7	MS	66	98	164
		9	Professional degree (e.g., MD, DDS)	2	3	5
		Y	No answer	2	6	8
		X	DNA: No earned degree	4	19	23

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
(2) Year of degree (second named):						
IX	26-27/		1924-1934	5	13	18
			1935-1945	13	25	38
			1946-1953	42	73	115
			1954-1959	77	107	184
			1960-1964	71	106	177
			1965-1969	35	56	91
		YY	No answer	4	15	19
		XX	DNA: No earned degree	4	19	23

80. [77] (Continued)

(3) Major field (second named): (Mapped variable, see Appendix D for detailed classifications.)

Column	Code	Category	Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX 28-29/		Education (e.g., elementary, secondary, curriculum, audio-visual)	40	79	119
		Educational administration	18	36	54
		Vocational and applied arts (e.g., industrial arts, home economics)	6	21	27
		Psychology	62	71	133
		Social science	30	55	85
		Math, physical and biological sciences	29	54	83
		English, philosophy, and language arts	32	35	67
		Music and art	15	25	40
		Profession (e.g., medicine, law, business)	8	4	12
	YY	No answer	7	15	22
	XX	DNA: No earned degree	4	19	23

(4) Degree in education (second named):

Column	Code	Category	Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX 30/	1	Yes	120	210	330
	2	No	123	176	299
	Y	No answer	4	9	13
	X	DNA: No earned degree	4	19	23

IX 31-36/ Institution for third-named degree. See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID.
C

(1) Earned degree (third named):

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX	37/	1	BA	2	10	12
		2	MA or MBA	2	4	6
		3	M.Ed.	1	-	1
		4	Ed.D.	59	87	146
		5	Ph.D.	107	163	270
		6	BS	4	6	10
		7	MS	3	4	7
		8	Other doctorate (e.g., business, theology, music)	3	3	6
		9	Professional degree (e.g., MD, DDS)	-	4	4
		0	Educational specialist or professional diploma	3	3	6
		Y	No answer	3	10	13
		X	DNA: No earned degree	64	120	184

(2) Year of degree (third named):

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX	38-39/		1925-1944	2	16	18
			1945-1960	52	72	124
			1961-1966	67	97	164
			1967-1969	58	93	151
			1970	2	1	3
		YY	No answer	6	15	21
		XX	DNA: No earned degree	64	120	184

(3) Major field (third named): (Mapped variable, see Appendix D for detailed classifications)

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX	40-41/		Education (e.g., elementary, secondary, curriculum, audio-visual)	29	66	95
			Educational administration	23	35	58
			Vocational and applied arts (e.g., industrial arts, home economics)	6	10	16
			Psychology	59	63	122
			Social science	19	35	54
			Math, physical and biological sciences	13	31	44
			English, philosophy, and language arts	12	17	29
			Music and art	11	15	26
			Profession (e.g., medicine, law, business)	5	4	9
		YY	No answer	10	18	28
		XX	DNA: No earned degree	64	120	184

(4) Degree in education (third named):

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX	42/	1	Yes	109	172	281
		2	No	73	110	183
		Y	No answer	5	13	18
		X	DNA: No earned degree	64	119	183

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
81.	[78]		Dissertation			
IX	45/	0	Has not written a dissertation	60	119	179
		X	Has written or is writing a dissertation	191	293	484
		Y	No answer	-	2	2
82.	[79]		Sex			
IX	46/	1	Male	203	347	550
		2	Female	48	67	115
83.	[80]		Number of dependents, other than self			
IX	47-48/	00	None	40	56	96
		01	One	34	56	90
		02	Two	39	61	100
		03	Three	67	107	174
		04	Four	39	75	114
		05-12	Five or more	28	53	81
		YY	No answer	4	6	10
84.	[81]		Year of birth			
IX	49-50/		Before 1910	7	20	27
			1910-1919	27	49	76
			1920-1924	25	56	81
			1925-1929	51	96	147
			1930-1934	59	95	154
			1935-1939	60	63	123
			1940-1945	20	31	51
		YY	No answer	2	4	6

85. [82] (a) Where did you live most of the time while you were growing up?

I 27-28/ See Appendix C for listing of states.

(b) Where do you live now?

I 29-30/ See Appendix C for listing of states.

85. [82] (Continued)

(c) How would you characterize where you grew up and where you live now?

Grew up:

				Funding	Not Funding	Total
IX	55/	1	Farm	30	50	80
		2	Small town	65	119	184
		3	Moderate size town or city	54	104	158
		4	Suburb of a large city	28	37	65
		5	Large city	71	97	168
		Y	No answer	3	7	10

Live now:

				Funding	Not Funding	Total
IX	56/	1	Farm	2	5	7
		2	Small town	48	77	125
		3	Moderate size town or city	88	173	261
		4	Suburb of a large city	59	74	133
		5	Large city	49	77	126
		Y	No answer	5	8	13

86. [83] What is the highest level of formal education reached by your spouse? Father? Mother?

(a) Spouse:

				Funding	Not Funding	Total
IX	57/	0	No spouse	21	29	50
		1	8th grade or less	-	2	2
		2	Some high school	2	3	5
		3	Completed high school	13	41	54
		4	Some college	45	72	117
		5	Graduated from college	42	81	123
		6	Some graduate school	32	52	84
		7	First professional degree	14	12	26
		8	Master's Degree	58	79	137
		9	Ph.D. or Ed.D.	15	25	40
		Y	No answer	9	18	27

(b) Father:

				Funding	Not Funding	Total
IX	58/	1	8th grade or less	64	126	190
		2	Some high school	36	56	92
		3	Completed high school	51	73	124
		4	Some college	28	68	96
		5	Graduated from college	25	29	54
		6	Some graduate school	6	8	14
		7	First professional degree	13	18	31
		8	Master's degree	11	13	24
		9	Ph.D. or Ed.D.	11	9	20
		Y	No answer	6	14	20

86. [83] (Continued)

(c) Mother:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX 59/	1	8th grade or less	45	107	152
	2	Some high school	38	49	87
	3	Completed high school	70	117	187
	4	Some college	39	70	109
	5	Graduated from college	35	36	71
	6	Some graduate school	7	5	12
	7	First professional degree	5	9	14
	8	Master's degree	5	7	12
	9	Ph.D. or Ed.D.	2	1	3
	Y	No answer	5	13	18

87. [84] Were your parents ever employed in educational work?

(a) Father:

IX 60/	1	Yes	42	54	96
	2	No	205	350	555
	Y	No answer	4	10	14

(b) Mother:

IX 61/	1	Yes	52	87	139
	2	No	193	321	514
	Y	No answer	6	6	12

88. [85] In what religion were you raised? What is your present religion?

(a) Religion in which raised:

IX 62/	1	Catholic	31	66	97
	2	Jewish	33	31	64
	3	Protestant	156	265	421
	9	Other (e.g., Greek Orthodox, Hindu)	6	14	20
	0	None	7	20	27
	Y	No answer	18	18	36

(b) Present religion:

IX 63/	1	Catholic	27	51	78
	2	Jewish	21	22	43
	3	Protestant	109	197	306
	9	Other (e.g., Greek Orthodox, Hindu)	18	34	52
	0	None	52	84	136
	Y	No answer	24	26	50

89. [86] Race:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX 64/	1	Caucasian	239	386	625
	2	Negro	4	8	12
	9	Other (e.g., Indian, Oriental)	2	5	7
	Y	No answer	6	15	21

90. [87] In which of the following categories was your total income for 1968? What do you expect it to be for 1969?

(a) 1968:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX 65/	1	Under $5,000	16	23	39
	2	$5,000-$7,499	19	14	33
	3	$7,500-$9,999	22	44	66
	4	$10,000-$14,999	89	154	243
	5	$15,000-$19,999	65	100	165
	6	$20,000-$24,999	27	47	74
	7	$25,000-$29,999	3	11	14
	8	$30,000 or more	1	7	8
	Y	No answer	9	14	23

(b) 1969:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
IX 66/	1	Under $5,000	8	8	16
	2	$5,000-$7,499	6	5	11
	3	$7,500-$9,999	11	28	39
	4	$10,000-$14,999	77	134	211
	5	$15,000-$19,999	88	115	203
	6	$20,000-$24,999	40	71	111
	7	$25,000-$29,999	6	25	31
	8	$30,000 or more	5	14	19
	Y	No answer	10	14	24

DATA ADDITIONS

91. [88] Topic of Proposal

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
(a) Subject matter					
I 40/	1	Agriculture	3	3	6
	2	Art (manual--graphics, painting, sculpture)	5	5	10
	3	Building design	1	-	1
	4	Business	2	5	7
	5	Education (administration, finance, history of, philosophy of; teacher training)	65	101	166
	6	English (rhetorical arts--cinema, literature, speech, theatre)	14	23	37
	7	Foreign languages and linguistics	2	10	12
	8	Home economics	2	3	5
	9	Industrial arts	3	3	6
	0	Information processing (data retrieval systems, library)	8	12	20
41/	1	Mathematics and statistics	16	21	37
	2	Music	11	17	28
	3	Physical education, health, and recreation (dancing)	7	17	24
	4	Physiological measurements	2	3	5
	5	Psychology (educational, personality, school, testing and measurement, counseling, guidance and placement)	71	122	193
	6	Reading	15	15	30
	7	Science (biological, environmental, or physical)	11	24	35
	8	Social science (area studies, economics, geography, history, international relations, political science)	9	29	38
	9	Speech pathology and audiology	-	8	8
	Y	Behavioral science research, environmental focus	16	12	28
	0	Subject not elsewhere classified (e.g., Headstart, aviation)	3	8	11
	X	Not classifiable by subject (e.g., student activism)	1	2	3
			267	443	710
(b) Instructional methods:					
I 42/	1	Computer assisted	5	10	15
	2	Programmed	6	15	21
	3	Audio-visual	17	39	56
	Y	No instructional method indicated	10	10	20
	X	Not applicable	213	340	553

FIELD READER

QUESTIONNAIRE

Code for

Field Reader Questionnaire

1. Have you been engaged in research during any of the years listed below:

				Total
1969:				
XI	7/	1	Research on education	237
		2	Research other than on education	64
		3	Research on education and another field	62
		0	Not engaged in research	58
		Y	No answer	2
1968:				
XI	8/	1	Research on education	231
		2	Research other than on education	61
		3	Research on education and another field	75
		0	Not engaged in research	54
		Y	No answer	2
1967:				
XI	9/	1	Research on education	235
		2	Research other than on education	65
		3	Research on education and another field	71
		0	Not engaged in research	50
		Y	No answer	2
1966:				
XI	10/	1	Research on education	227
		2	Research other than on education	67
		3	Research on education and another field	66
		0	Not engaged in research	61
		Y	No answer	2
1965:				
XI	11/	1	Research on education	217
		2	Research other than on education	63
		3	Research on education and another field	71
		0	Not engaged in research	70
		Y	No answer	2

1. Engaged in research (continued)

1964:

				Total
XI	12/	1	Research on education	207
		2	Research other than on education	65
		3	Research on education and another field	67
		0	Not engaged in research	82
		Y	No answer	2

2. Have you ever submitted any proposals to the U.S. Office of Education's Regional Research Program?

				Total
XI	13/	1	Yes	107
		2	No	314
		Y	No answer	2

IF YES: (a) How many have you submitted?

				Total
XI	14-15/	01	One	56
		02	Two	19
		03	Three	14
		04-12	Four or more	17
		YY	No answer	3
		XX	DNA: None submitted	314

(b) What have the outcomes been?

Pending

				Total
XI	16-17/	00	None	88
		01	One	13
		02-03	Two or three	4
		YY	No answer	4
		XX	DNA: None submitted	314

Funded

				Total
XI	18-19/	00	None	36
		01	One	44
		02-03	Two or three	19
		04-07	Four or more	6
		YY	No answer	4
		XX	DNA: None submitted	314

Not funded

				Total
XI	20-21/	00	None	52
		01	One	35
		02	Two	12
		03-05	Three or more	6
		YY	No answer	4
		XX	DNA: None submitted	314

3. Have you ever received a research grant from any of these sources?

				Total
XIII	9/	1	U.S. Office of Education	198
	10/	1	Another federal agency	155
	11/	1	State or municipal government	95
	12/	1	Private foundation	155
	13/	1	Commercial organization	42
	14/	1	Your own institution	228
	15/	1	Educational organization (e.g., AAUP, Phi Delta Kappa)	14
	16/	1	No answer	2
	8/	1	No research grant received	64
				(953)

4. (a) What is your major field or specialty?

Education

XI	23/	1	Administration	66
		2	Curriculum	28
		3	Research and statistics	45
		4	Teacher training	88
		5	Instructional technology	7
		6	Special (e.g., business, adult, higher, comparative)	20

Psychology

XI	24/	1	Developmental	8
		2	Guidance and counseling	13
		3	Learning	13
		4	Personality	4
		5	Testing and measurement	18
		6	Educational	8
		7	Clinical	1
		9	Other (e.g., social, experimental)	10

Social Science

XI	25/	1	History	4
		2	Political science	5
		3	Sociology	23
		9	Other (e.g., economics, anthropology)	11

Other

XI	26/	4	Math; physical; biological sciences	15
		5	English and language arts	26
		6	Music and art	5
		7	Profession (e.g., law, medicine)	5

4. (b) Within your major field, do you specialize in any of the sub-areas listed below?

				Total
XIII	20/	1	Pre-school	44
	21/	1	Elementary	120
	22/	1	Secondary	134
	23/	1	College	218
	24/	1	Graduate	142
	25/	1	Adolescent	31
	26/	1	Adult	52
	27/	1	Vocational	57
	28/	1	Distributive	5
	19/	1	None	79
	29/	1	No answer	16
				(898)

5. At present, how do you divide your professional time?

Per cent time curriculum or educational program development

XI	28-29/	01-20		131
		21-40		41
		41-60		10
		61-80		2
		81-100		3
		00	No time this area	229
		YY	No answer	7

Per cent time research

XI	30-31/	01-20		160
		21-40		110
		41-60		45
		61-80		19
		81-100		11
		00	No time this area	71
		YY	No answer	7

Per cent time services

XI	32-33/	01-20		139
		21-40		39
		41-60		7
		61-80		4
		81-100		-
		00	No time this area	227
		YY	No answer	7

5. How do you divide your professional time? (con'td)

Per cent time teaching

				Total
XI	34-35/	01-20		89
		21-40		114
		41-60		72
		61-80		32
		81-100		3
		00	No time this area	106
		YY	No answer	7

Per cent time other (e.g., administration)

				Total
XI	36-37/	01-20		90
		21-40		70
		41-60		57
		61-80		39
		81-100		40
		00	No time this area	120
		YY	No answer	7

6. Are you an advisor for doctoral dissertations?

				Total
XI	38/	1	Yes	244
		2	No	171
		Y	No answer	8

IF YES: (a) How many dissertations are you currently supervising?

				Total
XI	39-40/	01-02	One or two	51
		03-04	Three or four	81
		05-09	Five to nine	76
		10-27	Ten or more	31
		YY	No answer	13
		XX	DNA: Not an advisor for doctoral dissertations	171

(b) Are any of these dissertations supported by the USOE Regional Research Program?

			Total
41/	1	Yes	18
	2	No	224
	3	Don't know	8
	Y	No answer	8
	X	DNA: Not an advisor for doctoral dissertations	165

7. Are you now under contract to the U.S. Office of Education as a field reader?

				Total
XI	42/	1	Yes	339
		2	No	77
		Y	No answer	7

8. In all, how many years have you been a field reader for the U.S. Office of Education?

XI	43-44/	01-02	One or two	45
		03	Three	144
		04	Four	97
		05	Five	72
		06-13	Six or more	58
		YY	No answer	7

9. Altogether, how many USOE proposals have you reviewed?

XI	45-46/	01-05	One to five	80
		06-14	Six to fourteen	110
		15-29	Fifteen to twenty-nine	75
		30-90	Thirty to ninety	88
		99	One hundred or more	51
		YY	No answer	19

10. Of these proposals, about how many were submitted to the Regional Research Program?

XI	47-48/	01-03	One to three	68
		04-10	Four to ten	73
		11-40	Eleven to forty	53
		41-99	Forty-one or more	51
		YY	Cannot recall exact number	178

11. Thinking back, would you say that the quality of the proposals you have reviewed for the Regional Research Program has changed in the following respects:

(a) The criterion educational significance is more, or less, frequently satisfied now than in the past?

XI	49/	1	More frequently satisfied	98
		2	No observable change	167
		3	Less frequently satisfied	20
		0	No impression	100
		Y	No answer	38

11. Has the quality of proposals changed? (continued)

(b) The criterion soundness of research design is more, or less, frequently satisfied now than in the past?

				Total
XI	50/	1	More frequently satisfied	123
		2	No observable change	153
		3	Less frequently satisfied	26
		0	No impression	83
		Y	No answer	38

12. Do you think that a copy of the comments made by field readers should be sent routinely to each applicant?

XI	51/	1	Yes, comments should be sent routinely to all applicants	246
		2	Only to applicants who request them	84
		3	Only to applicants whose proposals have been rejected	5
		4	Only to applicants whose proposals have been funded	3
		5	No, comments should not be sent to any applicant	64
		0	No opinion	17
		Y	No answer	4

13. Should field readers be informed of the outcomes of the proposals they evaluate?

XI	52/	1	Yes	358
		2	No	29
		0	No opinion	35
		Y	No answer	1

14. Should the final report be reviewed by a field reader who recommended the project for funding?

XI	53/	1	Yes	214
		2	No	75
		0	No opinion	123
		Y	No answer	11

Total

15. The present USOE Evaluation Form asks the reviewer to:
   (a) Provide an overall evaluation of the proposal;
   (b) Discuss the proposal as it relates to the reviewer's area of specialization; and
   (c) State to what extent the proposal satisfied four criteria:
      (1) educational significance
      (2) soundness of research design
      (3) adequacy of personnel and facilities
      (4) economic efficiency

Would you recommend any of the following changes in the Evaluation Form:

FOR REGIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM PROPOSALS

				Total
XIII	33/	1	Eliminate (b) above	87
	34/	1	Provide a rating scale for each of the four criteria	143
	35/	1	Standardize the form by using check-lists instead of essay-type answers	69
	36/	1	Separate the criterion "adequacy of personnel and facilities" into two criteria, "adequacy of personnel" and "adequacy of facilities"	159
	37/	1	Perforate the form so that comments recorded below the perforation could be sent to the applicant, while those above would be for USOE exclusively	92

Eliminate one or more of the criteria in (c) above:

38/	1	Educational significance	6
39/	1	Soundness of research design	2
40/	1	Adequacy of personnel and facilities	12
41/	1	Economic efficiency	37
32/	1	None of the changes indicated in columns 33-41 above	172

Add other criteria to (c) above:

44/	1	Significance beyond education	76
45/	1	Creativity of researcher	68
46/	1	Suitability for replication	89
47/	1	Standardize form with both check-lists and space for essay-type answers	16
43/	1	None of the changes indicated in columns 44-47 above	262
			(1290)

15. (continued)

FOR ALL USOE PROPOSALS

				Total
XIII	52/	1	Eliminate (b)	111
	53/	1	Provide a rating scale for each of the four criteria	207
	54/	1	Standardize the form by using check-lists instead of essay-type answers	96
	55/	1	Separate the criterion "adequacy of personnel and facilities" into two criteria, "adequacy of personnel" and "adequacy of facilities"	231
	56/	1	Perforate the form so that comments recorded below the perforation could be sent to the applicant, while those above would be for USOE exclusively	121
	Eliminate one or more of the criteria in (c):			
	57/	1	Educational significance	10
	58/	1	Soundness of research design	3
	59/	1	Adequacy of personnel and facilities	11
	60/	1	Economic efficiency	43
	51/	1	None of the changes indicated in columns 52-60 above	89
	Add other criteria to (c):			
	63/	1	Significance beyond education	112
	64/	1	Creativity of researcher	98
	65/	1	Suitability for replication	124
	66/	1	Standardize form with both check-lists and space for essay-type answers	18
	62/	1	None of the changes indicated in columns 63-67 above	203
				(1477)

16. As you know, some proposals submitted to the Regional Research Program are reviewed at a panel session; others are reviewed only by individual field readers. On the average, when serving as an individual field reader how long has it taken you to read a proposal and to complete the USOE Evaluation Form?

Average reviewing time:

				Total
XI	58-59/	01	One hour	52
		02	Two hours	105
		03	Three hours	78
		04	Four hours	61
		05-30	Five to thirty hours	77
			Median 2.88 hours; Mean 3.49 hours	
		YY	No answer	48
		XX	Never individual field reader	2
XI	60/	0	Never individual field reader	2

17. Have you participated in one or more panel meetings to review proposals for the Regional Research Program?

				Total
XI	61/	1	Yes	115
		2	No	304
		Y	No answer	4

IF YES: (a) On how many panels have you served?

				Total
XI	62-63/	01	One	46
		02-03	Two or three	35
		04-20	Four or more	30
		YY	No answer	8
		XX	DNA: Never participated in a panel session	304

(b) About how long does it take you to review a proposal for a panel session?

				Total
XI	64-65/	01	One hour	63
		02	Two hours	29
		03-12	Three or more hours	17
			Median 1.36; Mean 1.72	
		YY	No answer	10
		XX	DNA: Never participation in a panel session	304

17. Have you participated in panel meetings? (cont'd)

(c) What do you consider the optimum number of proposals for a panel to review in one day?

			Total
XI 66-67/	01-10	Ten or less	29
	11-19	Eleven to nineteen	32
	20	Twenty	34
	21-35	Twenty-one or more Median 15.09; Mean 14.85	12
	YY	No answer	12
	XX	DNA: Never participated in a panel session	304

18. Do you have any ideas for improving the review process--either by panel or by mail?

Less than five per cent of the respondents answered Question 18, because questions 12 through 15 anticipated their suggestions about improving the review process. As a result, the few suggestions offered have not been listed here.

19. On balance, which system of review do you think yields better evaluations of Regional Research Program proposals: (a) proposals reviewed at a panel session? (b) those reviewed by correspondence?

			Total
XI 71/	1	At a panel session	133
	2	By correspondence	27
	0	Can't compare the two	238
	Y	No answer	25

20. In addition to being a field reader, have you ever been a consultant to USOE?

			Total
XI 72/	1	Yes	216
	2	No	169
	0	Cannot recall	31
	Y	No answer	7

21. Have you ever reviewed proposals for a granting agency other than USOE?

				Total
XII	7/	1	Yes	307
		2	No	98
		0	Cannot recall	17
		Y	No answer	1

IF YES: (a) For what type of agency?

				Total
XIII	68/	1	Another federal agency	145
	69/	1	State or municipal government	102
	70/	1	Private foundation	120
	71/	1	Professional association	110
	72/	1	Educational consortium	49
	73/	1	Own institution	201
	74/	1	Foreign (e.g., Canadian government)	6
	75/	1	Commercial organization	5
	76/	Y	No answer	1
	77/	X	DNA: Has not reviewed proposals for other granting agency	115
				(854)

IF YES: (b) Do you think that the quality of proposals submitted to USOE is better, about the same, or not as good as other proposals you have reviewed?

				Total
XII	9/	1	Proposals submitted to USOE are better	50
		2	About the same	160
		3	Not as good as others	57
		0	Not comparable	35
		Y	No answer	6
		X	DNA: Has not reviewed proposals for other granting agency	115

22. Have you ever been an editorial consultant for a scientific journal?

				Total
XII	10/	1	Yes	239
		2	No	174
		0	Cannot recall	1
		Y	No answer	9

23. Are you a member of any national professional societies?

				Total
XII	11/	1	Yes	415
		2	No	3
		Y	No answer	5

IF YES: Please name the two which are of greatest value to you.

XII 12-14/ For detailed listing of first named professional societies, see Appendix B.

Subject classification of FIRST named professional society.

				Total
XII	75-76/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	6
		11	Educational administration	9
		12	Curriculum	7
		13	Research and statistics	110
		15	AV and instructional technology	5
		16	Special education (e.g., adult, international, higher)	16
		17	Classroom teaching	25
		18	Vocational and applied arts (e.g., industrial arts, home economics, agriculture)	17
		20	General psychology	53
		21	Developmental	2
		22	Guidance and counseling	12
		25	Testing and measurement	1
		28	Exceptional children	2
		31	Sociology	21
		32	Political science	4
		33	History	4
		34	Other social science (e.g., anthropology, economics)	20
		35	Math; physical, biological sciences	21
		36	English and language arts	30
		37	Music and art	23
		38	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	2
		39	Profession as a role (e.g., AAUP); honorary society (Phi Delta Kappa)	12
		YY	No answer	18
		XX	DNA: Not a members of a national professional society	3

23. Member of national professional societies? (cont'd) **Total**

XII 15-17/ For detailed listing of second named professional societies, see Appendix B.

Subject classification of SECOND named professional society.

			Total
XII 77-78/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	5
	11	Educational administration	17
	12	Curriculum	7
	13	Research and statistics	74
	14	Teacher training	1
	15	AV and instructional technology	2
	16	Special education (e.g., adult, international, higher)	20
	17	Classroom teaching	26
	18	Vocational and applied arts (e.g., industrial arts, home economics, agriculture)	13
	20	General psychology	36
	21	Developmental	3
	22	Guidance and counseling	11
	25	Testing and measurement	7
	26	Educational Psychology	1
	28	Exceptional children	6
	31	Sociology	5
	32	Political science	4
	33	History	2
	34	Other social science (e.g., anthropology, economics)	36
	35	Math; physical; biological sciences	21
	36	English and language arts	18
	37	Music and art	14
	38	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	5
	39	Profession as a role (e.g., AAUP); honorary society (e.g., Phi Delta Kappa)	36
	YY	No answer	50
	YY	DNA: Not a member of a national professional society	3

24. At present, are you an officer of an academic or professional society?

XII 18/	1	Yes	144
	2	No	275
	Y	No answer	4

IF YES: Name of society

XII 19-21/ For detailed listing of professional societies in which respondents are officers, see Appendix B.

24. (Continued)

Subject classification of societies in which respondents are officers.

				Total
XII	73-74/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	5
		11	Educational administration	4
		12	Curriculum	3
		13	Research and statistics	12
		14	Teacher training	1
		15	AV and instructional technology	2
		16	Special education (e.g., adult, international, higher)	7
		17	Classroom teaching	17
		18	Vocational and applied arts (e.g., industrial arts, home economics, agriculture)	10
		20	General psychology	9
		22	Guidance and counseling	1
		26	Educational psychology	1
		28	Exceptional children	2
		31	Sociology	9
		32	Political science	3
		33	History	1
		34	Other social science (e.g., anthropology, economics)	10
		35	Math; physical, biological sciences	4
		36	English and language arts	13
		37	Music and art	15
		38	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	1
		39	Profession as a role (e.g., AAUP); honorary society (e.g., Phi Delta Kappa)	9
		YY	No answer	9
		RR	DNA: Not an officer of an academic or professional society	275

25. Within the last two years have you attended a meeting of an academic or professional society?

XII	22/	1	Yes	415
		2	No	3
		Y	No answer	5

26. How many research studies (articles, monographs, or books) have you published, and what was the date of your first publication?

Articles

			Total
XII 23-24/	01		7
	02		17
	03		19
	04		18
	05-10		86
	11-25		107
	26-99		125
	00	Published but not articles	9
	YY	No answer	7
	XX	DNA: Has not published any research studies	28

Monographs

			Total
XII 25-26/	01		47
	02		60
	03-04		52
	05-10		42
	11-50		31
	00	Published but not monographs	156
	YY	No answer	7
	XX	DNA: Has not published any research studies	28

Books

			Total
XII 27-28/	01	One	63
	02	Two	46
	03-05	Three to five	58
	06-30	Six or more	29
	00	Published but not books	192
	YY	No answer	7
	XX	DNA: Has not published any research studies	28

26. (Continued)

Date of first publication

				Total
XII	29-30/		1968-1970	3
			1964-1967	44
			1960-1963	65
			1956-1959	70
			1950-1955	89
			1940-1949	64
			Prior to 1940	44
		YY	No answer	16
		XX	DNA: Has not published any research studies	28
XII	31/	0	No research studies published	28
		Y	No answer	5
		X	DNA: At least one publication	390

27. Would you describe your research interest as mainly basic or applied?

				Total
XII	32/	1	Basic	88
		2	Applied	269
		3	Both basic and applied	48
		Y	No answer	18

28. Some researchers interested in education seek mainly to achieve recognition from behavioral scientists outside the field of education, while others are primarily concerned with being recognized by researchers within education or by school practitioners. Which group's judgment is most important to you personally?

				Total
XII	33/	1	Researchers within education	144
		2	Researchers outside education	122
		3	School practitioners	91
		0	None of these	36
		Y	No answer	30

29. Through a variety of sources, researchers get an overall impression of funding agencies. Is it your current impression that the Regional Research Program is limited to a few areas of special interest, or does it cover a broad range of interests in education?

			Total
XII 34/	1	Few areas of special interest	71
	2	Broad range of interests	177
	0	No impression	165
	Y	No answer	10

30. Do you think that the USOE Regional Research Program tends to be orthodox or venturesome in its support of research?

			Total
XII 35/	1	Orthodox; more likely to support established lines of research	164
	2	Venturesome; willing to take risks in developing new lines of research on education	87
	0	No opinion	161
	Y	No answer	11

31. As far as departures from the original proposal are concerned, is it your opinion that the Regional Research Program tends to be fairly strict or somewhat permissive?

			Total
XII 36/	1	Fairly strict	75
	2	Fairly permissive	98
	0	No opinion	239
	Y	No answer	11

32. Do you think that the Regional Research Program should encourage the researcher to investigate certain definite areas (e.g., reading), or should it encourage him to develop his own area of interest within the field of education?

			Total
XII 37/	1	Encourage researcher to investigate certain definite areas	73
	2	Encourage researcher to develop his own interest	261
	3	No opinion	54
	Y	No answer	35

33. In comparing procedures that an applicant must follow when submitting a proposal to the Regional Research Program with those required by other agencies, would you say that the Regional Research Program involves more, about the same, or somewhat less "red tape"?

			Total
XII 38/	1	More "red tape"	43
	2	About the same amount	155
	3	Somewhat less "red tape"	83
	0	No opinion	131
	Y	No answer	11

34. Some researchers view the regulation requiring clearance of educational data-gathering instruments as a good idea, whereas others regard it as an unwarranted intrusion by USOE. What is your opinion, if any?

			Total
XII 39/	1	Good idea	172
	2	Unwarranted intrusion	122
	0	No opinion	102
	Y	No answer	27

35. Have you ever submitted any data-gathering instruments to USOE for clearance?

			Total
XII 40/	1	Yes	109
	2	No	306
	Y	No answer	8

36. As you may know, it is standard practice for the USOE to withhold a fixed percentage of a grant until the final report has been approved. Do you think this is a good idea?

			Total
XII 41/	1	Agree with this practice	319
	2	Disagree with it	57
	0	No opinion	37
	Y	No answer	10

37. A stated goal of the Regional Research Program is:

> "To encourage small colleges to undertake research programs so that students may benefit from having professors who are engaged in educational research activities."

Do you think that this goal should be emphasized more, about the same, or less than it is now?

			Total
XII 42/	1	More	164
	2	About the same	112
	3	Less	72
	0	No opinion	60
	Y	No answer	15

38. The present ceiling on funds for proposals submitted to the Regional Research Program is $10,000. What do you think the ceiling on funds should be?

			Total
XII 43-45/ (entered as hundreds of dollars)		$ 5,000	4
		7,500	1
		8,000	2
		10,000	138
		11,000	1
		12,000	6
		12,500	4
		15,000	53
		20,000	63
		25,000	60
		30,000	4
		40,000	1
		50,000	10
	999	Recommends no ceiling	7
	YYY	No answer	69
		MEDIAN	$15,000

Please comment on your preference as to what the ceiling on RRP funds should be.

Raise ceiling:

XII 46 or 47/	1	To allow for inflationary increase in costs	67
	2	To permit greater flexibility in research design	37
	4	To provide higher salaries for research and clerical staff and obtain necessary equipment	21
	6	To strengthen the program in general	5

Lower ceiling:

XII 47/	5	Applicant's institution should match funds, if necessary	4

No change:

XII 47/	3	Present ceiling adequate for small project research	57

38. Ceiling on RRP funds (continued)

Other:

				Total
XII	47/	7	No ceiling. Nature of project should determine amount of grant	1
	46 or 47/	8	Other (e.g., no amount specified, but prefers moderate grants to many rather than large grants to a few)	3
		YY	No answer	240

39. Listed below are some possible advantages of being a field reader for the Regional Research Program. Indicate those that apply to you personally.

XII	54/	1	Acquisition of 'intelligence' about USOE granting practices	181
	55/	1	Contact with educational researchers from other institutions	164
	56/	1	Contact with USOE officials	138
	57/	1	Exposure to new research ideas	307
	58/	1	Intellectual stimulation	268
	59/	1	Opportunity to contribute ideas to young researchers	166
	60/	1	Opportunity to influence research on education	239
	61/	1	Professional prestige	90
	62/	1	Other (e.g., opportunity to perform a public service)	25
	53/	1	Perceives no professional advantage	7
	63/	1	No answer	23

Additional comments, either positive or negative, about the Regional Research Program

			Total
Positive comments:			
XII	50/5; 51/6	Basically a sound program	50
Negative comments:			
XII	51/9	Poorly administered	13
	51/4, 5	Inadequate remuneration for field readers	27
Recommendations			
XII	49/4; 50/4	Program should have more funds	16
	49/2; 50/1, 2	Improve contact between field readers and regional office	26
		Give greater emphasis to:	
	50/7; 51/7, 8	(1) Practical implications of research	19
	49/1, 6; 50/3, 6; 51/2, 3	(2) Supporting good young researchers	13
	51/1	Little or no knowledge of program	24
	49-51/YYY	No answer	271
			(459)

Code for

Field Reader Background Data*

Card	Column	Code	Item	Respondent	Non-Respondent
1. Institution from which earned a degree (FIRST named)					
XIV	7-12/		See Nash college file (EASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID. First two digits of Nash college file identify state in which institution located. See Appendix C for listing of states.		
		YYYYYY	No answer	32	13
2. Earned degree (first named institution)					
XIV	13/	1	BA; PhB	4	-
		2	MA; MBA	19	2
		3	M.Ed.	2	1
		4	Ed.D.	104	13
		5	Ph.D.	251	43
		6	BS; BBA	2	-
		7	MS	4	1
		8	Other doctorate (e.g., business, theology, music)	4	-
		9	Professional degree (e.g., MD, DDS)	2	2
		0	Educational specialist or professional diploma	1	-
		Y	No answer	30	13
3. Year of degree (first named institution)					
XIV	14-15/		1924 - 1939	35	3
			1940 - 1949	58	12
			1950 - 1954	76	16
			1955 - 1959	88	15
			1960 - 1964	75	9
			1965 - 1968	26	3
		YY	No answer	65	17

*Source: Office of Education, Bureau of Research, Field Reader catalogs.

4. Major field (first named degree)

			Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 16-17/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	4	-
	11	Educational administration	25	2
	12	Curriculum	7	2
	13	Research and statistics	9	-
	14	Teacher training	13	1
	16	Special education (e.g., adult, higher, international)	15	1
	17	Primary or secondary education	9	-
	18	Vocational and applied arts (e.g., technical, distributive, industrial arts)	12	1
	19	Education: not specified	19	3
	20	General psychology	22	4
	21	Developmental	1	-
	22	Guidance and counseling	4	4
	23	Learning	-	1
	25	Testing and measurement	4	1
	26	Educational psychology	34	6
	27	Clinical psychology	2	-
	31	Sociology	17	1
	32	Political science	3	1
	33	History	2	-
	44	Other social science (e.g., economics, anthropology)	10	2
	55	Math; physical; biological sciences	19	2
	66	English and language arts	15	10
	77	Music and art	10	-
	88	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	3	-
	YY	No answer	164	33

5. Institution from which earned a degree (SECOND named)

XIV 18-23/ See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID. First two digits of Nash college file identify state in which institution located. See Appendix C for listing of states.

		Respondent	Non-Respondent
YYYYYY	No answer	43	16
XXXXXX	DNA: No second named institution	7	-

6. Earned degree (second named institution)

			Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 24/	1	BA; PhB	34	8
	2	MA; MBA	205	34
	3	M.Ed.	43	2
	6	BS; BBA	23	2
	7	MS	69	14
	9	Professional degree (e.g., MD, DDS)	1	-
	Y	No answer	41	15
	X	DNA: No second named institution	7	-

7. Year of degree (second named institution)

		Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 25-26/	1918 - 1934	36	4
	1935 - 1944	62	11
	1945 - 1949	61	14
	1950 - 1954	89	13
	1955 - 1959	67	6
	1960 - 1964	21	5
	YY No answer	80	22
	XX DNA: No second named institution	7	-

8. Major field (second named degree)

	Code	Field	Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 27-28/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	3	-
	11	Educational administration	22	2
	12	Curriculum	1	1
	14	Teacher training	11	2
	16	Special education (e.g., adult, higher, international)	7	-
	17	Primary or secondary education	11	1
	18	Vocational and applied arts (e.g., technical, distributive, industrial arts)	23	1
	19	Education not specified	20	2
	20	General psychology	25	5
	21	Developmental	3	-
	22	Guidance and counseling	10	2
	23	Learning	-	1
	26	Educational psychology	22	6
	27	Clinical psychology	1	-
	31	Sociology	9	-
	32	Political science	4	1
	33	History	4	-
	44	Other social science (e.g., economics, anthropology)	11	2
	55	Math; physical; biological sciences)	27	3
	66	English and language arts	13	12
	77	Music and art	10	-
	88	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	2	-
	YY	No answer	177	34
	XX	DNA: No second named degree	7	-

9. Institution from which earned a degree (THIRD named)

			Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 29-34/		See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID. First two digits of Nash college file identify state in which institution located. See Appendix C for listing of states.		
	YYYYYY	No answer	52	15
	XXXXXX	DNA: No third named institution	57	8

10. Earned degree (third named institution)

			Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 35/	1	BA; PhB	182	29
	2	MA; MBA	6	2
	6	BS; BBA	124	20
	7	MS	2	1
	Y	No answer	52	15
	X	DNA: No third named institution	57	8

11. Year of degree (third named institution)

			Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 36-37/		1919 - 1934	43	7
		1935 - 1939	41	7
		1940 - 1944	33	8
		1945 - 1949	57	9
		1950 - 1954	76	7
		1955 - 1962	29	8
	YY	No answer	87	21
	XX	DNA: No third named institution	57	8

12. Major field (third named degree)

			Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 38-39/	10	Physical education, health, recreation	1	-
	11	Educational administration	2	1
	12	Curriculum	2	-
	14	Teacher training	7	2
	16	Special education (e.g., adult, higher, international)	3	-
	17	Primary and secondary education	7	2
	18	Vocational and applied arts (e.g., technical, distributive, industrial arts)	22	3
	19	Education not specified	13	1
	20	General psychology	23	6
	26	Educational psychology	3	-
	31	Sociology	5	-
	32	Political science	2	1
	33	History	11	-
	44	Other social science e.g., economics, anthropology)	13	-
	55	Math; physical; biological sciences	43	5
	66	English and language arts	25	10
	77	Music and art	14	1
	88	Other profession (e.g., law, medicine)	1	-
	YY	No answer	169	35
	XX	DNA: No third named degree	57	8

13. Present position

			Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV 40-41/	00	Research director or research specialist	29	5
	10	Departmental chairman	18	3
	11	Full professor	182	29
	12	Associate professor	45	6
	13	Assistant professor	15	2
	14	Other faculty (e.g., adjunct, lecturer)	10	1
	30	Administrative officer (e.g., vice-president of university development, dean, executive secretary)	70	10
	40	Program director (e.g., director, program of student development; director, recreation and youth council)	16	4
	50	Counselor or consultant	3	1
	80	School administrator (below college level)	8	-
	YY	No answer	26	14
	XX	Retired	1	-

14. Institutional affiliation

XIV 42-47/ See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID. First two digits of Nash college file identify state in which institution located. See Appendix C for listing of states.

		Respondent	Non-Respondent
YYYYYY	None indicated	18	11
XXXXXX	Not an institution of higher education	57	13

15. Year of employment at this institution

			Respondent	Non-Respondent
XIV	48-49/	1928 - 1952	69	9
		1953 - 1960	79	19
		1961 - 1964	86	9
		1965 - 1966	71	16
		1967 - 1968	70	9
		YY No answer	48	13

16. Case identification

XIV	78/	0 Removed from questionnaire sample--expired or out of country	-	7
		5 Non-respondent		75

PROPOSAL CONTENT
(Respondent Section)

Code for

Proposals Submitted to USOE Regional Research Program in FY '68

		Funded	Not Funded	Total
GROUP TO BE STUDIED				
XXIV 8/ 1	Community	5	4	9
XXII 8/ 1	Explicit sample size	3	4	7
2	Approximate sample size	1	-	1
Y	Not specified	1	-	1
9-13/	Number of cases in sample:			
	One	-	3	3
	Two	1	1	2
	Five	1	-	1
	Fourteen	1	-	1
	Thirty-five	1	-	1
YYYYY	Not specified	1	-	1
XXIV 9/ 1	Parents	1	4	5
XXII 14/ 1	Explicit sample size	-	2	2
2	Approximate sample size	-	2	2
Y	Not specified	1	-	1
15-19/	Number of cases in sample:			
	Five	-	1	1
	Fifty	-	1	1
	One hundred	-	1	1
	Fourteen thousand	-	1	1
YYYYY	Not specified	1	-	1
XXIV 10/ 1	School Board	-	1	1
XXII 20/ 1	Explicit sample size	-	-	-
2	Approximate sample size	-	-	-
Y	Not specified	-	1	1

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	11/	1	School District	3	3	6
XXII	26/	1	Explicit sample size	1	2	3
		2	Approximate sample size	-	1	1
		Y	Not specified	2	-	2
	27-31/		Number of cases in sample:			
			One	1	-	1
			Six	-	2	2
			Eight	-	1	1
		YYYYY	Not specified	2	-	2
XXIV	12/	1	School	12	20	32
XXII	32/	1	Explicit sample size	11	11	22
		2	Approximate sample size	1	-	1
		Y	Not specified	-	9	9
	31-37/		Number of cases in sample:			
			1	1	1	2
			3 or 4	2	6	8
			6 to 12	2	2	4
			20 to 49	5	1	6
			50 to 151	2	1	3
		YYYYY	Not specified	-	9	9
XXIV	13/	1	Principals	5	11	16
XXII	38/	1	Explicit sample size	2	2	4
		2	Approximate sample size	-	-	-
		Y	Not specified	3	9	12
	39-43/		Number of cases in sample:			
			6	1	-	1
			16	1	-	1
			50	-	1	1
			800	-	1	1
		YYYYY	Not specified	3	9	12

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	14/	1	Other administrators	10	31	41
XXII	44/	1	Explicit sample size	2	5	7
		2	Approximate sample size	4	8	12
		Y	Not specified	4	18	22
	45-49/		Number of cases in sample:			
			12 to 50	1	4	5
			75 to 150	1	4	5
			152 to 208	2	2	4
			300 to 1000	2	3	5
		YYYYY	Not specified	4	18	22
XXIV	15/	1	Students	149	228	377
XXII	50/	1	Explicit sample size	40	44	84
		2	Approximate sample size	60	105	165
		Y	Not specified	49	79	128
	51-55/		Number of cases in sample:			
			6 to 50	19	30	49
			51 to 100	14	35	49
			101 to 200	27	25	52
			201 to 500	21	32	53
			50[illegible] to 3000	13	24	37
			5000 to 22000	6	3	9
		YYYYY	Not specified	49	79	128
XXIV	16/	1	Teachers	24	53	77
XXII	56/	1	Explicit sample size	6	6	12
		2	Approximate sample size	5	18	23
		Y	Not specified	13	29	42
	57-61/		Number of cases in sample:			
			5 to 50	2	11	13
			51 to 150	6	5	11
			200 to 600	1	4	5
			1200 to 3500	2	4	6
		YYYYY	Not specified	13	29	42

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	7/	1	Guidance counselors	2	4	6
XXII	62/	1	Explicit sample size	-	-	-
		2	Approximate sample size	1	2	3
		Y	Not specified	1	2	3
	63-67/		Number of cases in sample:			
			10	1	-	1
			32	-	1	1
			1250	-	1	1
		YYYYY	Not specified	1	2	3
XXIV	17/	1	Other (e.g., employers, citizens, taxpayers)	34	48	82
XXII	68/	1	Explicit sample size	15	11	26
		2	Approximate sample size	5	11	16
		Y	Not specified	14	26	40
	69-73/		Number of cases in sample:			
			1 to 20	6	6	12
			21 to 70	4	4	8
			90 to 300	8	6	14
			350 to 1600	2	6	8
		YYYYY	Not specified	14	26	40
XXIV	18/	X	Not applicable	39	83	122

If Students to be Studied:

(a) Race or ethnic group:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	20/	1	Caucasian	14	14	28
	21/	1	Negro	14	13	27
	22/	1	Oriental	2	4	6
	23/	1	American Indian	3	2	5
	24/	1	Chinese	-	1	1
	25/	1	Japanese	-	1	1
	26/	1	Mexican-American	1	2	3
	27/	1	Foreign - other	2	7	9
	28/	1	Not specified	137	204	341
	29/	1	Not applicable	92	176	268
				265	424	689

If Students to be Studied (continued)

(b) Economic group:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	32/	1	Welfare or poverty	14	12	26
	33/	1	Low income	14	14	28
	34/	1	Middle income	11	15	26
	35/	1	Upper income	4	1	5
	36/	1	Not specified	133	206	339
	37/	1	Not applicable	92	176	268
				268	424	692

SUBJECT MATTER

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXII	76/	1	Agriculture	3	3	6
		2	Art (manual--graphics, painting, sculpture)	5	5	10
		3	Building design	1	-	1
		4	Business	2	5	7
		5	Education (administration, finance, history of, philosophy of; teacher training)	65	101	166
		6	English (rhetorical arts--cinema, literature, speech, theatre)	14	23	37
		7	Foreign languages and linguistics	2	10	12
		8	Home economics	2	3	5
		9	Industrial arts	3	3	6
		0	Information processing (data retrieval systems, library)	8	12	20
	77/	1	Mathematics and statistics	16	21	37
		2	Music	11	17	28
		3	Physical education, health, and recreation (dancing)	7	17	24
		4	Physiological measurements	2	3	5
		5	Psychology (educational, personality, school, testing and measurement, counseling, guidance and placement)	71	122	193
		6	Reading	15	15	30
		7	Science (biological, environmental, or physical)	11	24	35
		8	Social science (area studies, economics, geography, history, international relations, political science)	9	29	38

SUBJECT MATTER (continued)

		Funded	Not Funded	Total
9	Speech pathology and audiology	-	8	8
Y	Behavioral science research, environmental focus	16	12	28
0	Subject not elsewhere classified (e.g.,Headstart, aviation)	3	8	11
X	Not classifiable by subject (e.g., student activism)	1	2	3
		267	443	710

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXII	78/	1	Computer assisted	5	10	15
		2	Programmed	6	15	21
		3	Audio-visual	17	39	56
		Y	No instructional method indicated	10	10	20
		X	Not applicable	213	340	553

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL(S) TO BE STUDIED

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	39/	1	Pre-school	16	18	34
	40/	1	Elementary (grade specified below)	54	88	142
	41/	1	Secondary (grade specified below)	49	94	143
	42/	1	Junior college (grade specified below)	15	15	30
	43/	1	College (grade specified below)	71	122	193
	44/	1	Graduate	4	9	13
	45/	1	Entire school system	5	2	7
	46/	1	Vocational and Applied Arts	12	14	26
	48/	1	Not specified	19	40	59
	49/	1	Does not apply	36	53	89
				287	460	747

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
EXPLICIT GRADE(S) TO BE STUDIED						
XXIV	51/	1	All primary grades (1-6)	-	1	1
	52/	1	First	10	16	26
	53/	1	Second	9	19	28
	54/	1	Third	13	21	34
	55/	1	Fourth	20	20	40
	56/	1	Fifth	19	23	42
	57/	1	Sixth	25	22	47
	58/	1	Seventh	8	25	33
	59/	1	Eighth	8	19	27
	60/	1	Ninth	10	18	28
	62/	1	Tenth	15	13	28
	63/	1	Eleventh	12	16	28
	64/	1	Twelfth	14	15	29
	65/	1	All secondary grades (7-12)	1	3	4
	66/	1	Freshman (college)	18	31	49
	67/	1	Sophomore (college)	14	13	27
	68/	1	Junior (college)	8	6	14
	69/	1	Senior (college)	10	13	23
	70/	1	Elementary grade not specified	52	91	143
	71/	1	Higher grade not specified	98	181	279
	72/	1	Elementary grades not applicable	147	241	388
	73/	1	Higher grades not applicable	102	162	264
				613	969	1582
STUDY DESIGN, METHODOLOGY						
XXV	8/	1	Developmental (not research, per se)	34	67	101
	9/	1	Documentary (content analysis of data collected for other purposes)	36	46	82
	10/	1	Experiment, quasi-experiment	98	135	233
	11/	1	Participant and non-participant observation	32	59	91
	12/	1	Secondary analysis	11	8	19
	13/	1	Sociometry	1	3	4
	14/	1	Standardized achievement or psychological tests	82	126	208
	15/	1	Survey (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)	89	138	227
	16/	1	Tests developed for study (aptitude, personality, achievement, etc.)	74	107	181
	17/	1	Other (e.g., follow-up panel, cost-benefit)	13	17	30
	18/	1	Not specified	3	4	7
	19/	1	Not applicable	1	6	7
				474	716	1190

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
MODES OF ANALYSIS						
XXV	21/	1	Analysis of covariance	20	28	48
	22/	1	Analysis of variance	66	64	130
	23/	1	Correlation or regression analysis	51	65	116
	24/	1	Descriptive-nonanalytic analysis	30	50	80
	25/	1	Discriminant function analysis	5	4	9
	26/	1	Factor analysis; cluster analysis	15	17	32
	27/	1	Qualitative or historical analysis	30	39	69
	28/	1	Tests of significance (t tests, chi-square, nonparametric, etc.)	55	82	137
	29/	1	Other (e.g., item analysis, systems analysis, Duncan's Range Test)	7	15	22
	30/	1	Not specified	54	115	169
	31/	1	Not applicable	-23	54	77
				356	533	889
MODES OF COMPUTATION AND DATA PROCESSING						
XXIII	12/	1	Computer	138	195	333
		9	Other (e.g., McBee cards, hand tabulating)	2	5	7
		Y	Not specified	84	162	246
		X	Not applicable	27	50	77
OUTCOME OF RESEARCH						
XXIII	13/	1	Book	15	18	33
		2	Part of book	1	2	3
		Y	Not specified	235	392	627
	14/		Number of journal articles:			
		1	One	7	15	22
		2	Two	1	2	3
		3	Three	-	1	1
		4	Four	-	1	1
		9	Plans articles, no number specified	87	105	192
		Y	Not specified	156	288	444

OUTCOME OF RESEARCH (continued)				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIII	15/	1	Research report (other than progress or final report)	10	29	39
		Y	Not specified	241	383	624
	16/	1	Dissertation	22	29	51
		Y	Not specified	229	383	612
	17/	1	Report at professional meeting	25	35	60
		2	Inservice educational program	6	10	16
		3	Report at professional meeting and inservice educational program	1	3	4
		4	Report at professional meeting and other (examples listed below)	2	10	12
		5	Inservice educational program and other (examples listed below)	2	1	3
		9	Other (e.g., course modifications, listing of library serials, project information inventory, bibliography of dissertations, historical materials, model for salary determination, guide for reading program, educational television program)	70	113	183
		Y	No outcome specified in Columns 13-17	70	148	218
		X	Some outcome specified (at least one numerical punch in columns 13-16. If 17/1-9 not included here, because appears above)	75	92	167

PROJECT TO BE CONDUCTED						
XXIII	18/	1	Within a research bureau	19	13	32
		2	With assistance of a research bureau	12	24	36
		R,Y	Not specified	220	374	594

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
BUDGET (AMOUNTS RECORDED IN TENS OF DOLLARS)						
Deck and column location of budget items:						
XXIII	22-24/		Total non-professional			
	25-27/		Employee benefits			
	28-30/		Travel			
	31-33/		Supplies and materials			
	34-36/		Communications			
	37-39/		Services (test, final report, duplication)			
	40-42/		Equipment			
	43-45/		Other direct costs			
	46-49/		Sub-total direct costs			
	50-53/		Indirect costs			
	61-65/		Total local contribution			
XXIII	19/21/		Total professional			
			$50 to $2,994	37	51	88
			$2,995 to $4,994	63	123	186
			$4,995 to $6,994	64	121	185
			$6,995 to $9,994	51	74	125
			$9,995 and over	30	27	57
		YYY	Not specified	4	7	11
		RRR	No budget available	2	11	13
XXIII	54-55/		Per cent indirect costs			
			As per cent of salaries and wages			
			30% or less	38	54	92
			31% to 40%	34	47	81
			41% to 50%	34	55	89
			51% to 92%	42	58	100
			As per cent of total direct costs			
			15% or less	31	43	74
			16% to 30%	32	59	91
			31% to 50%	14	14	28
			51% to 77%	4	5	9
	Base for indirect cost					
XXIII	56/	1	Salaries and wages	148	214	362
		2	Sub-total direct costs	81	121	202
		Y	Not specified	20	68	88
		R	No budget available	2	11	13

BUDGET (Continued)				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIII	57-60/		Federal funds requested			
			$210 to $4,994	29	44	73
			$4,995 to $7,994	41	80	121
			$7,995 to $9,494	48	72	120
			$9,495 to $9,894	38	70	108
			$9,895 to $9,994	51	63	114
			$9,995 to $10,000	44	84	128
		YYYY	Not specified	-	1	1
XXIII	66-67/		Per cent local contribution			
			10% or less	45	93	138
			11% to 20%	51	96	147
			21% to 30%	51	52	103
			31% to 45%	42	79	121
			46% to 96%	35	40	75
		YY	Not specified	27	54	81
PROJECT DIRECTOR'S TIME						
XXXIII	68-69/		Per cent time to be devoted to project			
LENGTH OF PROPOSAL						
XXIII	70-71/		Number of pages in proposal, single spaced, excluding budget and any appendices			
ONE OR MORE APPENDICES						
XXIII	72/	1	Yes	133	199	332
		2	No	112	204	316
		R,Y	Not recorded	6	11	17
RESPONDENT CONTROL VARIABLES						
1. Cooperating institution:						
XXV	35/	1	College or university	222	338	560
		2	State Department of Education	4	5	9
		3	School system	18	48	66
		4	Private agency	7	17	24
		9	Individual or other (.e.g, educational association)	-	6	6

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
2. Subdivision:						
XXV	37/	1	Education	100	164	264
		3	Research institute or bureau	12	12	24
		5	Both education and research institute	8	6	14
Liberal Arts Subdivision:						
XXV	38/	1	Psychology	26	20	46
		2	Sociology	8	12	20
		3	Other social science	16	20	36
		4	Math, physical or biological science	9	21	30
		5	English and language arts	12	25	37
		6	Music and art	4	14	18
		7	Liberal arts - NEC	4	-	4
		Y	Department not specified	2	3	5
Other Subdivision:						
XXV	39/	3	Professional school	2	2	4
		4	Engineering; applied science	7	4	11
		5	Library and languages	5	1	6
		6	Music and art	3	7	10
		7	Administrative officer	12	27	39
		8	Vocational and applied arts	6	5	11
		9	Audio-visual	1	1	2
		0	Physical education	5	7	12
	37/	Y	Subdivision not specified	-	1	1
		X	DNA: Not in higher education	29	75	104
				(271)	(427)	(698)

3. Status

Student working toward:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXV	41/	1	Master's	1	8	9
		2	Ed.D.	28	43	71
		3	Ph.D.	47	74	121
		X	Not a student	175	289	464

4. Research for dissertation:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
42/	2	Yes, Ed.D.	27	44	71
	3	Yes, Ph.D.	45	69	114
	X	Not for dissertation	178	296	474
	Y	No answer	1	5	6

5. Position: (see Appendix A for classification of position.)

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXV	44-45/	0	Research director	16	28	44
		1	Faculty	153	237	390
			[(F) (NF)]			
			[Prof. 43 64]			
			[Assoc. 46 67]			
			[Ass't. 54 89]			
			[Other 10 17]			
		2	Student assistant or fellow	5	19	24
		3	Administrative officer	11	30	41
		4	Program director	10	22	32
		5	Counselor or consultant	7	17	24
		7	Teacher	11	22	33
		8	School administrator	2	6	8
		Y	No answer	1	1	2
		X	DNA: Not employed	35	32	67

6. Major field

Education:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXV	47/	1	Administration	31	47	78
		2	Curriculum	15	40	55
		3	Research and statistics	11	23	34
		4	Teacher training	57	85	142
		5	Instructional technology	5	6	11
		6	Special education (e.g., adult, business)	7	21	28
		7	Teacher - below college level	1	12	13

Psychology:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXV	48/1	1	Developmental	11	9	20
		2	Guidance and counseling	19	29	48
		3	Learning	13	10	23
		4	Personality	4	5	9
		5	Testing and measurement	3	4	7
		6	Educational	7	7	14
		7	Clinical	3	4	7
		9	Other (e.g., social, experimental)	5	10	15

Social Science:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXV	49/	1	History	3	9	12
		2	Political science	5	5	10
		3	Sociology	10	15	25
		9	Other (e.g., anthropology, economics)	8	19	27

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
MAJOR FIELD (continued)						
			Other field or specialty:			
XXV	49/	4	Math; physical, biological sciences	12	22	34
		5	English and language arts	15	18	33
		6	Music and art	4	11	15
		X	Professions (e.g., medicine, nursing, law)	2	3	5
7. Previous grant						
XXV	51/1		One or more grants	140	267	407
	0		No grant received	108	141	249
	Y		No answer	3	6	9
8. Sex						
XXV	57/1		Male	203	347	550
	2		Female	48	67	115
9. Highest degree						
XXV	55/1		Ph.D. in Discipline	69	92	161
	2		Ph.D. in Education	28	55	83
	3		Ed.D.	45	67	112
	4		M.Ed.D.	18	30	48
	5		M.A. or M.S. in Education	26	73	99
	6		M.A. or M.S. in Discipline	50	66	116
	7		Other doctorate or professional degree	6	8	14
	8		B.A. or B.S.	9	18	27
	Y		No vitae available	-	5	5

PROPOSAL CONTENT
(Non-Respondent Section)

Code for

Proposals Submitted to USOE Regional Research Program in FY '68

		Funded	Not Funded	Total
	GROUP TO BE STUDIED			
XXIV 8/ 1	Community	-	5	5
XXII 8/ 1	Explicit sample size	-	4	4
2	Approximate sample size	-	-	-
Y	Not specified	-	1	1
9-13/	Number of cases in sample:			
	One	-	4	4
	Two	-	-	-
	Five	-	-	-
	Fourteen	-	-	-
	Thirty-five	-	-	-
YYYYY	Not specified	-	1	1
XXIV 9/ 1	Parents	-	4	4
XXII 14/ 1	Explicit sample size	-	2	2
2	Approximate sample size	-	1	1
Y	Not specified	-	1	1
15-19/	Number of cases in sample:			
	Two	-	1	1
	Fifty	-	1	1
	One hundred	-	-	-
	Three hundred	-	1	1
YYYYY	Not specified	-	1	1
XXIV 10/ 1	School Board	1	-	1
XXII 20/ 1	Explicit sample size	-	-	-
2	Approximate sample size	-	-	-
Y	Not specified	1	-	1

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	11/	1	School District	1	-	1
XXII	26/	1	Explicit sample size	-	-	-
		2	Approximate sample size	-	-	-
		Y	Not specified	1	-	1
XXIV	12/	1	School	3	9	12
XXII	32/	1	Explicit sample size	1	5	6
		2	Approximate sample size	1	1	2
		Y	Not specified	1	3	4
	33-37/		Number of cases in sample:			
			1 or 2	1	1	2
			3 or 4	-	1	1
			6 to 12	-	-	-
			20 to 60	1	2	3
			85 to 209	-	2	2
		YYYYY	Not specified	1	3	4
XXIV	13/	1	Principals	1	2	3
XXII	38/	1	Explicit sample size	-	-	-
		2	Approximate sample size	-	1	1
		Y	Not specified	1	1	2
	39-43/		Number of cases in sample:			
			6	-	-	-
			16	-	-	-
			40	-	1	1
			800	-	-	-
		YYYYY	Not specified	1	1	2

		Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV 14/ 1	Other administrators	1	4	5
XXII 44/ 1	Explicit sample size	-	1	1
2	Approximate sample size	-	-	-
Y	Not specified	1	3	4
45-49/	Number of cases in sample:			
	20	-	1	1
	75 to 150	-	-	-
	152 to 208	-	-	-
	300 to 1000	-	-	-
YYYYY	Not specified	1	3	4
XXIV 15/ 1	Students	17	70	87
XXII 50/ 1	Explicit sample size	4	25	29
2	Approximate sample size	8	22	30
R,Y	Not specified	5	23	28
51-55/	Number of cases in sample:			
	6 to 50	2	9	11
	51 to 100	4	9	13
	101 to 200	1	16	17
	201 to 500	4	9	13
	501 to 1000	1	3	4
	5000 to 22000	-	-	-
YYYYY	Not specified	5	24	29
XXIV 16/ 1	Teachers	6	14	20
XXII 56/ 1	Explicit sample size	-	7	7
2	Approximate sample size	4	2	6
Y	Not specified	2	5	7
57-61/	Number of cases in sample:			
	5 to 50	-	4	4
	51 to 150	1	4	5
	200 to 600	1	-	1
	1200 to 3500	2	1	3
YYYYY	Not specified	2	5	7

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	7/	1	Guidance counselors	-	2	2
XXII	62/	1	Explicit sample size	-	-	-
		2	Approximate sample size	-	-	-
		Y	Not specified	-	2	2
XXIV	17/	1	Other (e.g., employers, citizens, taxpayers)	1	13	14
XXII	68/	1	Explicit sample size	1	5	6
		2	Approximate sample size	-	3	3
		Y	Not specified	-	5	5
	69-73/		Number of cases in sample:			
			1 to 20	-	3	3
			21 to 70	1	2	3
			1500	-	1	1
			5000-5500	-	2	2
		YYYYY	Not specified	-	5	5
XXIV	18/	X	Not applicable	4	45	49

If Students to be Studied:

(a) Race or ethnic group:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	20/	1	Caucasian	2	6	8
	21/	1	Negro	2	6	8
	22/	1	Oriental	1	-	1
	23/	1	American Indian	-	1	1
	24/	1	Chinese	-	-	-
	25/	1	Japanese	-	1	1
	26/	1	Mexican-American	-	2	2
	27/	1	Foreign - other	-	4	4
	28/	1	Not specified	16	62	78
	29/	1	Not applicable	11	72	83
				32	154	186

If Students to be Studied (continued)

(b) Economic group:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	32/	1	Welfare or poverty	2	6	8
	33/	1	Low income	-	5	5
	34/	1	Middle income	1	4	5
	35/	1	Upper income	-	2	2
	36/	1	Not specified	16	63	79
	37/	1	Not applicable	11	72	83

SUBJECT MATTER

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXII	76/	1	Agriculture	-	2	2
		2	Art (manual--graphics, painting, sculpture)	-	1	1
		3	Building design	-	-	-
		4	Business	1	2	3
		5	Education (administration, finance, history of, philosophy of; teacher training)	6	36	42
		6	English (rhetorical arts--cinema, literature, speech, theatre)	4	11	15
		7	Foreign languages and linguistics	1	7	8
		8	Home economics	-	1	1
		9	Industrial arts	-	-	-
		0	Information processing (data retrieval systems, library)	1	7	8
	77/	1	Mathematics and statistics	2	6	8
		2	Music	1	3	4
		3	Physical education, health, and recreation (dancing)	-	2	2
		4	Physiological measurements	-	1	1
		5	Psychology (educational, personality, school, testing and measurement, counseling, guidance and placement)	6	42	48
		6	Reading	1	5	6
		7	Science (biological, environmental, or physical)	-	5	5
		8	Social science (area studies, economics, geography, history, international relations, political science)	1	11	12

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
SUBJECT MATTER (continued)						
		9	Speech pathology and audiology	-	-	-
		Y	Behavioral science research, environmental focus	4	4	8
		0	Subject not elsewhere classified (e.g.,Headstart, aviation)	2	4	6
		X	Not classifiable by subject (e.g., student activism)	-	1	1
				30	151	181
INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS						
XXII	78/	1	Computer assisted	2	1	3
		2	Programmed	-	4	4
		3	Audio-visual	-	9	9
		Y	No instructional method indicated	-	3	3
		X	Not applicable	28	130	158
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL(S) TO BE STUDIED						
XXIV	39/	1	Pre-school	2	5	7
	40/	1	Elementary (grade specified below)	13	26	39
	41/	1	Secondary (grade specified below)	5	23	28
	42/	1	Junior college (grade specified below)	-	6	6
	43/	1	College (grade specified below)	8	45	53
	44/	1	Graduate	2	5	7
	45/	1	Entire school system	1	1	2
	46/	1	Vocational and Applied Arts	-	5	5
	48/	1	Not specified	3	16	19
	49/	1	Does not apply	1	23	24
				35	155	190

EXPLICIT GRADE(S) TO BE STUDIED

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIV	51/	1	All primary grades (1-6)	-	-	-
	52/	1	First	2	4	6
	53/	1	Second	1	2	3
	54/	1	Third	1	3	4
	55/	1	Fourth	1	9	10
	56/	1	Fifth	2	8	10
	57/	1	Sixth	3	7	10
	58/	1	Seventh	2	7	9
	59/	1	Eighth	2	4	6
	60/	1	Ninth	3	5	8
	62/	1	Tenth	1	5	6
	63/	1	Eleventh	1	5	6
	64/	1	Twelfth	1	5	6
	65/	1	All secondary grades (7-12)	-	-	-
	66/	1	Freshman (college)	2	10	12
	67/	1	Sophomore (college)	-	2	2
	68/	1	Junior (college)	-	3	3
	69/	1	Senior (college)	-	3	3
	70/	1	Elementary grade not specified	8	30	38
	71/	1	Higher grade not specified	12	67	79
	72/	1	Elementary grades not applicable	11	91	102
	73/	1	Higher grades not applicable	13	58	71
				66	328	394

STUDY DESIGN, METHODOLOGY

XXV	8/	1	Developmental (not research, per se)	5	38	43
	9/	1	Documentary (content analysis of data collected for other purposes)	5	21	26
	10/	1	Experiment, quasi-experiment	14	49	63
	11/	1	Participant and non-participant observation	7	23	30
	12/	1	Secondary analysis	1	5	6
	13/	1	Sociometry	1	4	5
	14	1	Standardized achievement or psychological tests	5	41	46
	15/	1	Survey (questionnaires, interviews, etc.)	13	48	61
	16/	1	Tests developed for study (aptitude, personality, achievement, etc.)	7	26	33
	17/	1	Other (e.g., follow-up panel, cost-benefit)	1	5	6
	18/	1	Not specified	-	-	-
	19/	1	Not applicable	1	2	3
				60	262	322

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
MODES OF ANALYSIS						
XXV	21/	1	Analysis of covariance	3	8	11
	22/	1	Analysis of variance	3	21	24
	23/	1	Correlation or regression analysis	1	23	24
	24/	1	Descriptive-nonanalytic analysis	2	16	18
	25/	1	Discriminant function analysis	-	1	1
	26/	1	Factor analysis; cluster analysis	2	4	6
	27/	1	Qualitative or historical analysis	6	20	26
	28/	1	Tests of significance (t tests, chi-square, nonparametric, etc.)	3	26	29
	29/	1	Other (e.g., item analysis, systems analysis, Duncan's Range Test)	1	5	6
	30/	1	Not specified	11	31	42
	31/	1	Not applicable	3	32	35
				35	187	222

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
MODES OF COMPUTATION AND DATA PROCESSING						
XXIII	12/	1	Computer	14	57	71
		9	Other (e.g., McBee cards, hand tabulating)	-	1	1
		Y	Not specified	14	63	77
		X	Not applicable	2	24	26

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
OUTCOME OF RESEARCH						
XXIII	13/	1	Book	4	10	14
		2	Part of book	-	1	1
		Y	Not specified	26	136	162
	14/		Number of journal articles:			
		1	One	1	6	7
		2	Two	1	-	1
		3	Three	-	-	-
		4	Four	-	-	-
		9	Plans articles, no number specified	3	41	44
		Y	Not specified	25	100	125

OUTCOME OF RESEARCH (continued)				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIII	15/	1	Research report (other than progress or final report)	4	4	8
		Y	Not specified	26	143	169
	16/	1	Dissertation	3	8	11
		Y	Not specified	27	139	166
	17/	1	Report at professional meeting	1	5	6
		2	Inservice educational program	-	5	5
		3	Report at professional meeting and inservice educational program	-	-	-
		4	Report at professional meeting and other (examples listed below)	-	3	3
		5	Inservice educational program and other (examples listed below)	-	3	3
		6	Report at professional meeting, inservice educational program, and other (examples listed below)	1	-	1
		9	Other (e.g., course modifications, historical materials, model for salary determination, educational television program)	12	53	65
		Y	No outcome specified in Columns 13-17	7	47	54
		X	Some outcome specified (at least one numerical punch in columns 13-16. If 17/1-9 not included here, because appears above)	9	29	38
PROJECT TO BE CONDUCTED						
XXIII	18/	1	Within a research bureau	2	8	10
		2	With assistance of a research bureau	3	8	11
		R,Y	Not specified	25	131	156

BUDGET (AMOUNTS RECORDED IN TENS OF DOLLARS)

Deck and column location of budget items:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIII	22-24/		Total non-professional			
	25-27/		Employee benefits			
	28-30/		Travel			
	31-33/		Supplies and materials			
	34-36/		Communications			
	37-39/		Services (test, final report, duplication)			
	40-42/		Equipment			
	43-45/		Other direct costs			
	46-49/		Sub-total direct costs			
	50-53/		Indirect costs			
	61-65/		Total local contribution			
XXIII	19/21/		Total professional			
			$50 to $2,994	4	18	22
			$2,995 to $4,994	6	33	39
			$4,995 to $6,994	8	48	56
			$6,995 to $9,994	8	29	37
			$9,995 and over	2	15	17
		YYY	Not specified	1	1	2
		RRR	No budget available	1	3	4
XXIII	54-55/		Per cent indirect costs			
			As per cent of salaries and wages			
			30% or less	3	28	31
			31% to 40%	4	12	16
			41% to 50%	5	14	19
			51% to 92%	5	21	26
			As per cent of total direct costs			
			15% or less	2	18	20
			16% to 30%	4	20	24
			31% to 50%	3	8	11
			51% to 77%	-	3	3
			Base for indirect cost			
XXIII	56/	1	Salaries and wages	17	75	92
		2	Sub-total direct costs	9	49	58
		Y	Not specified	3	20	23
		R	No budget available	1	3	4

BUDGET (Continued)			Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXIII	57-60/	Federal funds requested			
		$210 to $4,994	1	11	12
		$4,995 to $7,994	6	12	18
		$7,995 to $9,494	8	26	34
		$9,495 to $9,894	4	33	37
		$9,895 to $9,994	4	33	37
		$9,995 to $10,000	7	31	38
	YYYY	Not specified	-	1	1
XXIII	66-67/	Per cent local contribution			
		10% or less	6	30	36
		11% to 20%	9	36	45
		21% to 30%	4	23	27
		31% to 45%	4	17	21
		46% to 96%	5	22	27
	YY	Not specified	2	19	21
PROJECT DIRECTOR'S TIME					
XXXIII	68-69/	Per cent time to be devoted to project			
LENGTH OF PROPOSAL					
XXIII	70-71/	Number of pages in proposal, single spaced, excluding budget and any appendices			
ONE OR MORE APPENDICES					
XXIII	72/ 1	Yes	16	76	92
	2	No	14	64	78
	R,Y	Not recorded	-	7	7
NON-RESPONDENT CONTROL VARIABLES					
1. Sex:					
XXV	57/1	Male	23	114	137
	2	Female	7	33	40

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
2. Employing Institution:						
XXV	60/	0	Board of Education, no level specified	-	7	7
		3	Junior high school	-	1	1
		4	Secondary school	3	2	5
		5	Research organization	-	6	6
		6	Junior college	-	5	5
		7	Four-year college	1	22	23
		8	University	19	76	95
		9	Teacher training institution (college, school or department of education)	3	6	9
		X	Not an educational institution	2	3	5
		R,Y	Not specified	2	19	21
3. Position:						
XXV	61-62/	01	Research director	-	9	9
		04	Research associate	-	2	2
		11	Professor	6	24	30
		12	Associate professor	1	21	22
		13	Assistant professor	7	20	27
		14	Instructor	-	10	10
		15	Lecturer	-	2	2
		21	Research assistant	1	1	2
		22	Fellow	1	2	3
		23	Student or graduate assistant	5	9	14
		31	Dean	-	1	1
		32	Department or division chairman	1	6	7
		33	Library administration	-	2	2
		35	General administration (e.g., assistant dean)	1	9	10
		40	Other	-	1	1
			Staff specialist:			
		51	Psychologist	-	2	2
		53	Researcher	2	4	6
		54	Counselor	1	-	1
		55	Consultant	-	2	2
		60	Other (e.g., system analyst)	-	3	3
			Lower level(s):			
		71	Classroom teacher	2	3	5
		81	Principal	-	1	1
		82	Superintendent	-	1	1
		90	General administration - lower school (e.g., program supervisor or assistant superintendent)	1	4	5
		RR,YY	Not specified	1	8	9

NOTE: If more than one title listed in proposal (e.g., Professor and departmental chairman) the professorial rank was coded.

4. Highest degree:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXV	64/	1	B.A. or B.S.	4	10	14
		2	M.A. or M.S.	2	25	27
		3	M.Ed.	-	5	5
		4	Ed.D.	5	18	23
		5	Ph.D.	14	54	68
		6	Other professional degree (e.g., M.D.)	-	3	3
		7	Doctor, but not degree specified	-	3	3
		8	Doctoral candidate	4	17	21
		Y	Not specified	1	12	13

5. Subdivision:

				Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXV	66/	0	Mathematics	1	4	5
		1	Physics and astronomy		2	2
		2	Chemistry	1	1	2
		4	Engineering	-	2	2
		5	Medical and biological sciences	1	2	3
		6	Psychology	4	18	22
		7	Social sciences	4	14	18
		8	Arts and humanities	3	27	30
		9	Education	13	59	72
		R	Not specified	1	10	11
		X	Does not apply	2	8	10

67-68/ For detailed code within subdivisions, see Appendix E (Specialties List).

6. Year of birth:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXV	70-71/	Year			
		Before 1910	2	10	12
		1910-1919	3	17	20
		1920-1924	4	17	21
		1925-1929	3	19	22
		1930-1934	6	15	21
		1935-1939	3	12	15
		1940-1945	2	6	8
	XX,YY	Not specified	7	50	57

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Code for

Proposal Evaluation

1. Submission date

8-13/ Month, day and year

2. Type of evaluation

Column	Code	Category	Field Reader	In-house
15/	0	None	(70)	(70)
	1	Individual review	1405	563
	2	Panel	444	

3. Field Reader

17-22/ Identification Number

4. Date Evaluation Form mailed and returned

24-27/ Month and day Form mailed to reviewer

29-32/ Month and day Form returned to Regional Office

5. Location of Field Reader's comments

(a) Educational significance

Column	Code	Category	Field Reader	In-house
34/	1	Page 1	146	
	2	Pages 2-4	1627	
	Y	No information	76	

(b) Facilities

Column	Code	Category	Field Reader	In-house
35/	1	Page 1	40	
	2	Pages 2-4	1243	
	Y	No information	566	

(c) Personnel

Column	Code	Category	Field Reader	In-house
36/	1	Page 1	61	
	2	Pages 2-4	1599	
	Y	No information	189	

5. Location of Field Reader's comments (continued)

(d) Research design

			Field Reader	In-house
37/	1	Page 1	118	
	2	Pages 2-4	1620	
	Y	No information	111	

(e) Economic efficiency

			Field Reader	In-house
38/	1	Page 1	60	
	2	Pages 2-4	1592	
	Y	No information	197	

6. Recommendation

			Field Reader	In-house
40/	1	Approval	628	205
	2	Provisional approval	447	33
	3	Disapproval	701	300
	4	Deferral	63	6
	Y	Not indicated	10	19

7. If proposal approved or provisionally approved, priority:

			Field Reader	In-house
42/	1	High	215	46
	2		342	52
	3		235	33
	4		138	16
	5	Low	93	11
	Y	No priority indicated	62	99
	X	DNA: proposal disapproved or deferred	764	306

8. Coder's interpretation of reviewer's evaluation

(a) Educational significance

			Field Reader	In-house
44/	1	Positive	567	101
	2	Relatively positive	309	36
	3	Equally positive and negative	236	34
	4	Relatively negative	267	66
	5	Negative	346	90
	6	Reviewer unable to evaluate	30	4
	7	Reviewer assumes this criterion satisfied	1	-
	8	Coder unable to classify reviewer's comments	5	-
	Y	No answer	74	214
	X	Reviewer's comments irrelevant	14	18

			Field Reader	In-house
8.		Coder's interpretation of reviewer's evaluation (continued)		
(b)		Facilities		
45/	1	Positive	387	68
	2	Relatively positive	318	32
	3	Equally positive and negative	20	11
	4	Relatively negative	41	5
	5	Negative	39	9
	6	Reviewer unable to evaluate	75	8
	7	Reviewer assumes this criterion satisfied	275	39
	8	Coder unable to classify reviewer's comments	4	1
	Y	No answer	674	386
	X	Reviewer's comments irrelevant	16	4
(c)		Personnel		
46/	1	Positive	460	79
	2	Relatively positive	362	39
	3	Equally positive and negative	99	22
	4	Relatively negative	178	30
	5	Negative	102	28
	6	Reviewer unable to evaluate	131	20
	7	Reviewer assumes this criterion satisfied	269	40
	8	Coder unable to classify reviewer's comments	5	2
	Y	No answer	216	290
	X	Reviewer's comments irrelevant	7	13
(d)		Research design		
47/	1	Positive	273	50
	2	Relatively positive	371	46
	3	Equally positive and negative	247	38
	4	Relatively negative	321	57
	5	Negative	450	121
	6	Reviewer unable to evaluate	43	8
	7	Reviewer assumes this criterion satisfied	12	1
	8	Coder unable to classify reviewer's comments	4	1
	Y	No answer	96	222
	X	Reviewer's comments irrelevant	32	19

8. Coder's interpretation of reviewer's evaluation (continued)

(e) Economic efficiency

Column	Code	Category	Field Reader	In-house
48/	1	Positive	538	81
	2	Relatively positive	327	44
	3	Equally positive and negative	87	21
	4	Relatively negative	144	32
	5	Negative	396	72
	6	Reviewer unable to evaluate	53	14
	7	Reviewer assumes this criterion satisfied	2	3
	8	Coder unable to classify reviewer's comments	5	1
	Y	No answer	225	285
	X	Reviewer's comments irrelevant	72	10

9. In-house reviewer

60-72/ Last name spelled out

74,76/ Initials of in-house reviewer, if available

10. Type of reviewer

Column	Code	Category	Field Reader	In-house
78/	1	Washington		326
	2	Regional office		237
	R	Outside field reader	1849	
		No review	70	

11. Card type

79/ 3 Evaluation

12. Number of reviews (or evaluations)

			Field Reader	In-house
By outside field reader:				
80/	1	None	70	
		One	648	
	2	Two	606	
	3	Three	337	
	4	Four	138	
	5	Five	99	
	6	Six	13	
	0	Seven	8	
By in-house reviewer:				
80/	1	One		424
	8	Two		120
	9	Three		15
	X	Four		3
	Y	Five		1

NON-RESPONDENT BACKGROUND

Background Data - Non-Respondents Only*

POSITION (individual responsible for conducting research. Typically, project director.) Cols 8-10

Type of affiliation:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXI	8/	0 Board of Education, no level specified	-	7	7
		3 Junior high school	-	1	1
		4 Secondary school	3	2	5
		5 Research organization	-	6	6
		6 Junior college	-	5	5
		7 Four-year college	1	22	23
		8 University	19	76	95
		9 Teacher training institution (college, school or department of education)	3	6	9
		X Not an educational institution	2	3	5
		R,Y Not specified	2	19	21

Title:

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXI	9-10/	01 Research director	-	9	9
		04 Research associate	-	2	2
		11 Professor	6	24	30
		12 Associate professor	1	21	22
		13 Assistant professor	7	20	27
		14 Instructor	-	10	10
		15 Lecturer	-	2	2
		21 Research assistant	1	1	2
		22 Fellow	1	2	3
		23 Student or graduate assistant	5	9	14
		31 Dean	-	1	1
		32 Departmental or division chairman	1	6	7
		33 Library administration	-	2	2
		35 General administration (e.g., assistant dean)	1	9	10
		40 Other	-	1	1

*Source: Proposal submitted to USOE Regional Research Program FY '68.

Title of Position (continued)

	Staff specialist:	Funded	Not Funded	Total
51	Psychologist	-	2	2
53	Researcher	2	4	6
54	Counselor	1	-	1
55	Consultant	-	2	2
60	Other (e.g., system analyst)	-	3	3
	Lower level(s):			
71	Classroom teacher	2	3	5
81	Principal	-	1	1
82	Superintendent	-	1	1
90	General administration - lower school (e.g., program supervisor or assistant superintendent)	1	4	5
RR,YY	Not specified	1	8	9

NOTE: If more than one title listed in proposal (e.g., Professor and departmental chairman) the professorial rank was coded.

BIRTHDATE

XXI 11-12/ Day
13-14/ Month
15-16/ Year

		Funded	Not Funded	Total
	Before 1910	2	10	12
	1910-1919	3	17	20
	1920-1924	4	17	21
	1925-1929	3	19	22
	1930-1934	6	15	21
	1935-1939	3	12	15
	1940-1945	2	6	8
XX,YY	Not specified	7	50	57

HIGHEST DEGREE

XXI 17/		Funded	Not Funded	Total
1	B.A. or B.S.	4	10	14
2	M.A. or M.S.	2	25	27
3	M.Ed.	-	5	5
4	Ed.D.	5	18	23
5	Ph.D.	14	54	68
6	Other professional degree (e.g., M.D.)	-	3	3
7	Doctor, but no degree specified	-	3	3
8	Doctoral candidate	4	17	21
Y	Not specified	1	12	13

INSTITUTION		Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXI 18-23/	See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID. For first two digits identify state in which institution of higher education located. See Appendix C for listing of states.			
20-23/XXXX	Other (e.g., private agency)	6	36	42

SUBDIVISION

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
XXI 24/	0	Mathematics	1	4	5
	1	Physics and astronomy	-	2	2
	2	Chemistry	1	1	2
	4.	Engineering	-	2	2
	5	Medical and biological sciences	1	2	3
	6	Psychology	4	18	22
	7	Social sciences	4	14	18
	8	Arts and humanities	3	27	30
	9	Education	13	59	72
	R	Not specified	1	10	11
	X	Does not apply	2	8	10

25-26/ For detailed code within subdivisions, see Appendix E (Specialties List).

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

27-28/ Where available, recorded in these columns.

SEX

			Funded	Not Funded	Total
30/	1	Male	23	114	137
	2	Female	7	33	40

INSTITUTIONS

Code for

Institutions
(Deck XXXXI)

INSTITUTION

1-6/ See Nash college file (BASR #B1050) for explicit institutional ID. First two digits identify state in which institution of higher education is located. See Appendix C for listing of states.

HIGHEST DEGREE OFFERED*

			Total
8/	3	Less than four year institution	23
	4	Four or five year baccalaureate degree granting program	66
	5	First professional level	8
	6	Master's	118
	7	Beyond Master's but less than doctorate	41
	8	Doctorate	196
	Y	No answer	13
	X	DNA: Not a degree granting institution	16

TYPE OF CONTROL*

			Total
10/	1	Public	244
	2	Private	210
	Y	No answer	24
	X	DNA: Not a degree granting institution	3

IF RESPONDENT:

			Total
12/	1	Respondent	244

Actual number of respondents:

			Total
13/	1	One	123
	2	Two	63
	3	Three	17
	4	Four	14
	5	Five	13
	6	Six	2
	7	Seven	4
	8	Eight	2
	9	Nine or more	6

*Source: Directory of U.S. Institutions of Higher Education (Fall, 1967), U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS 5.250:50052.

IF NON-RESPONDENT:

Column	Code	Category	Total
15/	1	Non-respondent	93

Actual number of non-respondents:

Column	Code	Category	Total
16/	1	One	69
	2	Two	16
	3	Three	2
	4	Four	4
	5	Five	-
	6	Six	1
	7	Seven	-
	8	Eight	-
	9	Nine or more	1

Number of years received USOE Bureau of Research funds, 1963-1967

Column	Code	Category	Total
18/	0	None	83
	1	One year	151
	2	Two years	89
	3	Three years	52
	4	Four years	33
	5	Five years	69
	Y	No answer	4

Total dollar amount of USOE Bureau of Research funds, 1963-1967

Column	Category	Total
20-26/	No funds	83
	Less than $5,000	28
	$5,000 - $9,999	60
	$10,000 - $29,999	59
	$30,000 - $59,999	55
	$60,000 - $99,999	44
	$100,000 - $249,999	49
	$250,000 - $499,999	47
	$500,000 - $999,999	23
	$1,000,000 - $8,850,000	29
YYYYYYY	Information not available	4

79-80/41

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPLICANT POSITION

01	Director of Research
02	Supervisor of Research
03	Coordinator of Research
04	Research Associate
06	Project Director
10	Department Chairman
11	Full professor
12	Associate Professor
13	Assistant Professor
14	Instructor
15	Lecturer
20	Post-graduate research student
21	Research Assistant
23	Graduate Assistant
24	Teaching Assistant
30	Director of service unit
31	Dean
33	Director of Library
35	General administration
37	Assistant to Dean
38	Assistant Dean
40	Supervisor
43	Program coordinator
45	Director of Extension
46	Associate director of special program
47	Director of educational program
49	Assistant Director special program
50	Guidance, NEC
51	Psychologist
54	Counselor
55	Consultant
58	Psychiatrist
71	Classroom teacher
72	Teacher, special education
73	Curriculum specialist
74	Speech therapist
75	Area specialist (e.g., drama)
81	Principal
82	Superintendent
84	Assistant Superintendent
85	Headmaster

APPENDIX B

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES

001	Adult Education Association of USA
002	American Anthropological Association
003	American Association for the Advancement of Science
004	American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation
005	American Association for Higher Education
006	American Association of Junior Colleges
007	American Association of Physics Teachers
008	American Association of School Administrators
009	American Association of University Professors
010	American Association on Mental Deficiency
011	American Chemical Society
012	American College of Sports Medicine
013	American College Personnel and Guidance Association
014	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
015	American Economics Association
016	American Educational Research Association
017	American Ethnological Society
018	American Home Economics Association
*020	American Institute of Biological Sciences
021	American Library Association
022	American Personnel and Guidance Association
023	American Philosophical Association
024	American Physical Society
025	American Political Science Association
026	American Psychological Association
027	American Society for Engineering Education
028	American Sociological Association
029	American Speech and Hearing Association
030	American Vocational Association
031	Association for Computing Machinery
032	Association for Educational Data Systems
033	Association for Institutional Research
034	Association for Student Teaching
035	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
036	Association of Asian Studies
037	Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors
038	Comparative Education Society
039	Council for Exceptional Children
040	Delta Pi Epsilon
041	Department of Audio-Visual Instruction of NEA
042	Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers
043	International Reading Association
044	International Society for Music Education
045	Kappa Delta Pi
046	Linguistic Society of America
047	Mathematics Association of America

*019. American Industrial Arts Association

048	Midwest Sociological Association
049	Modern Language Association
050	Music Educator's National Conference
051	National Art Education Association
052	National Association for Research in Science Teaching
053	National Association of Educational Broadcasters.
054	National Association of Geology Teachers
055	National Association of Science Teachers
056	National Association of Secondary School Principals
057	National Association of Social Workers
058	National Business Education Association
059	National Council of Teachers of English
060	National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
061	National Council for Measurement in Education
062	National Education Association
063	National Science Teachers' Association
064	National Society for Programmed Instruction
065	National Society for Study of Education
066	Phi Delta Kappa
067	Psychonomics Society
068	Sigma Xi
069	Society for Research in Child Development
070	Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues
071	Society of Technical Writers and Publishers
072	Southern Sociological Association
073	Speech Association of America

076	Academy of Management
077	Acoustical Society of America
078	American Academy of Physical Education
079	American Academy of Religion
080	American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies
081	American Association for Design and Drafting
082	American Association for Public Opinion Research
083	American Association of Collegial Schools of Business
084	American Association of Marriage Counselors
085	American Association of Teachers of French
086	American Bar Association
087	American Black Psychological Association
088	American College Art Association
089	American Dairy Science Association
090	American Federation of Musicians
091	American Group Psychotherapy Association
092	American Historical Association
093	American Institute of Industrial Engineers
094	American Marketing Association
095	American Mathematical Association
096	American Men of Science
097	American Musicological Society
098	American National Theatre and Academy
099	American Nurses' Association

100 American Orthopsychiatric Association
101 American Society for Aesthetics
102 American Society for Curriculum Development
103 American Society for Ethnohistory
104 American Society for Testing and Materials
105 American Society for Training and Development
106 American Society of Civil Engineers
107 American Society of Electrical Engineering
108 American Society of Information Science
109 American Society of Mechanical Engineers
110 American Society of Zoologists
111 American Statistical Association
112 American Vocational Education Association
113 Association for the Advancement of Medical Instrumentation
114 Association for Education in Journalism
115 Association for Measurement and Evaluation of Guidance
116 Association for the Study of Negro Life and History
117 Association of New York State Educators of the Emotionally Disturbed
118 Audio Engineering Society
119 Biometric Society
120 California Association of School Administrators
121 California Business Education Association
122 California Teachers' Association
123 Central Association of Science and Mathematics
124 Central States Foreign Language Teachers' Association
125 Central States Speech Association
126 College Art Association
127 College Music Society
128 Connecticut Science Teachers' Association
129 Delta Kappa Gamma
130 Eastern Sociological Society
131 Eastern Speech Association
132 Econometric Society
133 Educational Media Association of Canada
134 Educational Research Association of New York State
135 Epsilon Pi Tau
136 Finno-Ugric Society
137 Florida Academy of Science
138 Genetics Society of America
139 Geological Society of America
140 IBM Common Users Group
141 Idaho Academy of Science
142 Illinois Council of Teachers of Mathematics
143 Industrial Relations Research Association
144 Institute of General Semantics
145 Institute of Management Sciences
146 Institute of Mathematical Statistics
147 Institutional Research
148 International Association for Childhood Education
149 International Council of Psychologists
150 International Society of Plant Morphologists

151 Kappa Phi Kappa
152 Lutheran Education Association
153 Midwest Economics Association
154 Missouri State Teachers Association
155 Mountain-Plains Philosophical Association
156 National Association for Physical Education of College Women
157 National Association for Retarded Children
158 National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture
159 National Association of Disability Examiners
160 National Association of Geology Teachers
161 National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials
162 National Association of Teachers of Singing
163 National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
164 National Audio-Visual Association
165 National Catholic Education Association
166 National College Physical Education Association for Men
167 National Council of Family Relations
168 National Council of Social Studies
169 National Council of University Research Administrators
170 National Elementary Principals
171 National Parks and Recreation Society
172 National Rehabilitation Association
173 National Rehabilitation Counseling Association
174 National Society for the Study of Communication
175 National Tax Association
176 National Theater Conference
177 New Mexico Geological Society
178 New York City Coaches' Association
179 New York City Teachers' Association of Health and Physical Education
180 New York State Psychological Association
181 Oral History Association
182 Oregon Psychological Association
183 Organization of American Historians
184 Phi Kappa Phi
185 Philosophy of Education Society
186 Population Association
187 Public Administration Society
188 School Science and Mathematics
189 Shakespeare Association
190 Sigma Delta Chi
191 Sigma Psi
192 Society for Applied Anthropology
193 Society of Biblical Literature
194 Society for Promotion of Hellenic Studies (England)
195 Society for the Study of Social Problems
196 Southeastern Psychological Association
197 Southern Political Science Association
198 Southwestern Sociological Association
199 Texas Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation
200 Torrey Botanical Society
201 Vocational Rehabilitation Association
202 Western Philosophy of Education Association

APPENDIX C

STATE CODE

10	Alabama
11	Alaska
12	Arizona
13	Arkansas
14	California
15	Colorado
16	Connecticut
17	Delaware
18	District of Columbia
19	Florida
20	Georgia
21	Hawaii
22	Idaho
23	Illinois
24	Indiana
25	Iowa
26	Kansas
27	Kentucky
28	Louisiana
29	Maine
30	Maryland
31	Massachusetts
32	Michigan
33	Minnesota
34	Mississippi
35	Missouri
36	Montana
37	Nebraska
38	Nevada
39	New Hampshire
40	New Jersey
41	New Mexico
42	New York
43	North Carolina
44	North Dakota
45	Ohio
46	Oklahoma
47	Oregon
48	Pennsylvania
49	Rhode Island
50	South Carolina
51	South Dakota
52	Tennessee
53	Texas
54	Utah
55	Vermont
56	Virginia
57	Washington
58	West Virginia
59	Wisconsin
60	Wyoming
70	Foreign

APPENDIX D

MAJOR FIELD

Mapped location	Punch	
(4)	01	Psychology
(5)	02	Sociology
(5)	03	Other Social Science (e.g., Anthropology, Economics, History)
(9)	04	Profession (Engineering, Medicine, Library Science)
(6)	05	Physical Science
(6)	06	Mathematics, Computer Science
(6)	07	Biological Science
(7)	08	English and Literature
(7)	09	Foreign Language
(7)	10	Dramatic Arts
(8)	11	Fine Arts or Music
(3)	12	Vocational and Industrial Arts
(3)	13	Agriculture or Home Economics
(1)	14	Teacher Training and Methodology
(1)	15	Health and Physical Education
(7)	16	Liberal Arts, not specified
(1)	17	Education, not specified
(1)	18	Curriculum
(4)	19	Guidance and Counseling
(1)	20	Elementary Education
(1)	21	Comparative Education
(4)	22	Educational Psychology

Mapped location	Punch	
(8)	23	Art or Music Education
(6)	24	Science Education
(7)	25	Language Education
(7)	26	Religious Education
(2)	27	Educational Administration
(2)	28	Higher Education
(7)	29	Theology
(1)	30	Secondary Education
(6)	31	Earth Science
(9)	32	Management
(5)	33	Social Work
(4)	34	Human Development
(7)	36	Philosophy
(1)	37	Special Education
(3)	38	Agricultural Education
(1)	39	Teaching, not specified
(7)	40	Speech Education
(1)	41	Audio-visual Education
(8)	42	Architecture, City Planning
		Dual Majors
(4)	59	Engineering and Psychology
(4)	60	Counseling and Educational Psychology
(7)	61	Philosophy and Psychology
(6)	62	Mathematics and Physics
(1)	63	Elementary Education and English

Mapped location	Punch	
(2)	64	Administration and Guidance
(1)	65	Education and History
(5)	66	Economics and Sociology
(8)	67	Art and English
(4)	68	Guidance and Psychology
(7)	69	English and History
(4)	70	Education and Psychology
(1)	71	Education and Social Science
(6)	72	Biology and Physical Science
(8)	73	Music and Music Education
(5)	74	Industrial Relations and Sociology
(4)	75	Physical Education and Psychology
(7)	76	Journalism and Speech
(8)	77	History and Music
(1)	78	Physical Education and Secondary Education
(1)	79	Curriculum and Psychology
(5)	80	Business Administration and Economics
(7)	81	Counseling and Theology
(5)	82	Education and Sociology
(5)	83	Economics and Psychology
(1)	84	Curriculum and History
(1)	85	Curriculum and Supervision
(4)	86	Psychology and Speech
(5)	87	Political Science and Sociology

APPENDIX E

SPECIALTIES LIST

SURVEY OF EARNED DOCTORATES

Mathematics

000—Algebra
010—Analysis
020—Geometry
030—Logic
040—Number Theory
050—Probability, Math Stat.
  (see also 544, 670, 725, 920)
060—Topology

080—Computing Theory & Practice
085—Applied Mathematics

098—Mathematics, General
099—Mathematics, Other
  (note also 984: Math Educ.)

Physics and Astronomy

(Note: Theoretical scientists mark "T" on questionnaire following code No.)

100—Astronomy

110—Atomic & Molec. Physics
120—Electromagnetism
130—Mechanics
132—Acoustics
134—Fluids
136—Optics
138—Thermal Physics
140—Elementary Particles
150—Nuclear Structure
160—Solid State

198—Physics, General
199—Physics, Other

Chemistry

200—Analytical
210—Inorganic
220—Organic
230—Nuclear
240—Physical
250—Theoretical
260—Agricultural & Food
270—Pharmaceutical

298—Chemistry, General
299—Chemistry, Other

(see also Biochemistry, 540)

Earth Sciences

300—Mineralogy, Petrology,
  Geochemistry
310—Stratig.; Sedimentation
320—Paleontology
330—Structural Geology
340—Solid Earth Geophysics
350—Geomorph., Glacial Geology
360—Hydrology
370—Oceanography
380—Meteorology
390—Applied Geol.: Geol. Engr.;
  Econ. Geol.; Petroleum Geol.

398—Earth Sciences, General
399—Earth Sciences, Other

Fields Not Elsewhere Classified

899—Sci., General; Sci., Other;
  Other General Field

Engineering

400—Aeronautical & Astronautical
410—Agricultural
420—Civil
430—Chemical
435—Ceramic
440—Electrical
445—Electronics
450—Industrial
460—Engineering Mechanics
465—Engineering Physics
470—Mechanical
475—Metallurgy & Physical Met. Engin.
480—Sanitary
485—Textile

498—Engineering, General
499—Engineering, Other

Agricultural Sciences

500—Agronomy
502—Animal Husbandry
504—Fish & Wildlife
505—Forestry
506—Horticulture

508—Agriculture, General
509—Agriculture, Other

Medical Sciences

510—Medicine & Surgery
511—Pharmacy
512—Public Health
513—Veterinary Medicine
514—Hospital Administration

518—Medical Sciences, General
519—Medical Sciences, Other

Biological Sciences

520—Anatomy
522—Cytology
524—Embryology
530—Physiology, Animal
532—Physiology, Plant
534—Pathology
536—Pharmacology
540—Biochemistry
542—Biophysics
544—Biometrics, Biostatistics
  (see also 050, 670, 725, 920)
550—Botany
552—Phytopathology
560—Ecology
582—Entomology
570—Genetics
562—Hydrobiology
564—Microbiology
580—Zoology

598—Bio-Science, General
599—Bio-Science, Other

Psychology

600—Clinical
610—Counseling & Guidance
620—Developmental & Gerontological
630—Educational
641—Experimental
642—Comparative
643—Physiological
650—Industrial & Personnel
660—Personality
670—Psychometrics
  (see also 050, 544, 920)
635—School Psychology
680—Social

698—Psychology, General
699—Psychology, Other

Social Sciences

700—Anthropology
705—Archeology
745—Area Studies (specify area)
720—Economics
725—Econometrics
  (see also 050, 544, 670, 920)
727—Statistics
730—History
740—Geography
755—International Relations
750—Political Science, Public Admin.
760—Social Work
710—Sociology

798—Social Sciences, General
799—Social Sciences, Other

Arts & Humanities

800—Art, Fine & Applied (incl. hist. & crit.)
810-829 Lang. and Lit.
  810—Eng. & Amer.
  820—Modern Foreign, unspec.
  821—German
  822—Classical (specify)
  823—French
  824—Spanish & Portuguese
  825—Linguistics
  826—Italian
  827—Russian
  828—Other Slavic
  829—All other modern lang.
830—Music
840—Philosophy
815—Speech & Dramatic Arts

888—Arts & Humanities, General or School
889—Arts & Humanities, Other

Prof. Fields Not Listed Above

850—Business Administration
855—Home Economics
860—Journalism
865—Law, Jurisprudence
870—Library & Archival Science
880—Religion & Theology

Education

Note: For fields 900-947 and 960-967 final digit indicates level: 0—unspecified; 1—preschool; 2—elem., 3—secondary; 4—teacher training; 5—higher educ.; 6—adult educ.; 7—other.

905 - Educational research ctr.
900—Foundations: Social, Philosoph.
908—Elem. Educ., General
909—Secondary Educ., General
910—Educational Psychology
920—Educ. Meas. & Stat.
930—Educ. Admin. & Superv.
940—Guid., Couns., Student Pers.
950-959—Special Education
  950—Field Unspecified
  952—Gifted
  954—Speech
  956—Phys. Handicapped
  958—Emot. & Ment. Handicapped
960—Audio-Visual Media

Note: For fields 970-997, and 952-959 even number is for secondary level; next odd number indicates other than secondary level.

970—Agric.
972—Art
974—Business
976—English
978—Foreign L.
980—Home Ec.
982—Ind. Arts
984—Math
986—Music
988—Phys. Ed., Health
  & Recreation
990—Science Educ.
992—Social Sci. Educ.
994—Vocational Educ.
996—Other Special
  Field
998—Educ., General or Sch.
999—Educ., Other

Source: 1968 survey of earned doctorates in United States. National Science Foundation.